

A
D E F E N C E
O F

Passive Obedience

A N D
N O N - R E S I S T A N C E,
T O
Supreme and Sovereign POWERS.

In which is Shewn

That the Doctrine of *Passive-Obedience* or *Non-Resistance* in its True Notion, is agreeable both to the Laws of *Christ* and *this Realm*; and consequently is not to be Ridicul'd, or Condemn'd, but to be *Defended*, and *Preach'd* by its Ministers.

By *C H A R L E S P A L M E R*, M.A.
and Vicar of *Towcester*.

L O N D O N,

Printed, by *W. S.* for *J. Ward*, in the *Inner Temple-Lane*, and sold by *J. Morphew* near *Stationers-Hall*, 1710.

DEFENCE

OF

AND

NON-RESISTANCE

TO

Violence and Oppression

In which

THE DEFENCE OF THE
LAW, AND THE
RIGHTS OF THE
PEOPLE, ARE
CONSIDERED.

BY
J. A. H. H. H.

Printed in the year
1848.



A
DEFENCE
 OF
Passive Obedience, &c.

From these Words in Romans, XIII. 1.

Let every Soul be Subject to the Higher Powers.

Although I do not pretend to urge more Convincing Arguments for the Defence of *Passive Obedience*, than those which are publish'd in a Treatise, call'd, *Christianity the Doctrine of the Cross*. And altho' it would be the *Less* necessary to treat upon *this Subject*, did Men Impartially Read and Consider those various Testimonies of its Truth, which have been given both by the Writings and Practice of the Primitive Christians, and also by the great Cloud of Witnesses for it in *these latter Days*. † Yet since we now live amongst some, who Condemn and Ridicule the aforesaid Doctrine; and since it has been deliver'd of late from the Pulpit, as well as Press; That it is detestably impious and pernicious; against all Sense and Reason, and against the fundamental Laws of this Land; That it is hammer'd out of the Forge of Rome, That not Hell nor Rome ever invented a Doctrine so fitted and Calculated for the design of Enslaving a free People as this of *Passive Obedience*; Since thus, I say, That, which the Primitive Church hath Practic'd, and also our own Church hath Taught, as a Duty, is decry'd and condemn'd by some, who yet have subscrib'd to its Homilies; I hope it will not be term'd Pre-

† See their Names in the History of *Passive Obedience*.

sumption, if I also add my Mite to the large Treasure of Discourses concerning this Christian, Primitive, Protestant, and Legal Doctrine in its true notion. To which end as I have propos'd the Words of the Text, to be the Subject of the following Discourse, so from them I shall treat upon these following Heads.

First, What it is to be subject to the *Higher Powers*; and under this Head to shew that the *Subjection* to them containeth the Duty of Passive Obedience or Non-Resistance, in its true Notion.

2dly, That this Duty of Subjection to the Higher Powers is not only a Christian Duty, agreeable, to the *Laws* and *Practice* of *Christ* and his *Apostles*, to the Principles and Practice of the *Primitive Church*; but likewise it is agreeable to the particular *Laws* of *this Realm*; as well as Doctrine of *Our Church*.

3dly, I shall not only enquire into, but also shew the *Invalidity* of the Chiefest *Pleas* and *Objections* against it.

Lastly, I shall make some Application, and Conclude.

And First, What it is to be subject to the *Higher Powers*, and under this Head to shew, that the subjection to them containeth the Duty of Passive Obedience or Non-Resistance in its true notion: And here lest some should stretch the notion of this Subjection too far, or suppose more to be contain'd in it, than is requir'd, I think it not improper to premise, first, that however this Duty containeth Passive Obedience, and tho' the Word *Subjection* is of larger extent than is the Word *Obedience*, * yet the being Subject to, doth not Contain or Enjoyn our doing of that which our Higher Powers Command, unless it be also lawful to be done; when, besides the want of a Moral or lawful Power in them to require such things that are Sinful, there is a Higher Power than theirs, which forbids them, viz. God's. Nor is there much occasion to insist upon this Exception, since besides the appeal of St. Peter to the Jewish Magistrates, whether it was not right to hearken to God more than them. † There are few or no Christians who extend the Duty of Subjection to an active obeying of the Higher Powers in things Sinful. But

2dly, As to be subject to them doth not signifie or Enjoyn our doing Evil, at their Command, so neither doth it require or imply our assisting them in their doing of that which we know to be such; since this is not only to partake with them in their Sins, ‖ but also it is to do Evil, if we give assistance to, and without which they could not do, it. And accordingly as this is more than due Allegiance, or Obedience ac-

* Anas de Conc. Lib. 5. cap. 20. † Acts 4 19. ‖ Ephes. 5. 7.

cording to Law; so we find, that however the Primitive Christians were Eminent Examples of *Passive Obedience*, yet would they not assist their Emperours in destroying their Fellow Christians, where the accusation against them was no other than that of their being Orthodox Christians *. But now however it doth not follow, that because we are to be subject to, we must obey or assist the Higher Powers, in things Sinful; yet doth the Duty of Subjection either signifie our *active Obedience* to their Lawful Commands, or else the submitting to, without resisting or taking up Arms against them, because of illegal Oppressions; There being *Opposition*, rather than *Subjection*, where Men will neither obey them when they may or can, nor yet will submit to, but rather resist them by force of Arms, and even take up the Sword against those whose Office it is to bear it; † and which as it is to resist them, so is put by St. Paul, as Contrary to the Duty of Subjection, and which by the Concession of Grotius ‡, doth include in it self, *non Resistendi necessitatem*, or the necessity of Non-Resistance. It is confess'd indeed, That However, Resistance is opposite to Subjection, yet it is not a Resisting of, or inconsistent with our Duty to them, if when call'd before or oppress'd by the Higher Powers, we plead our Cause or our Rights, (and accordingly we find that however, St. Paul sets forth the Sin and Danger of Resistance, he did not fail to plead the Privileges he had as a Roman, and that he ought not to be scourged or deliver'd to the Fury of his Enemies without a Tryal. † And if it is not a breach of our Duty to plead our rights before; much less is it so, to Petition them for Redress, under their illegal Proceedings, and to claim the help of their Laws and Courts. Nay, I add yet further; That however it is not Consistent with Subjection to stretch out our Hands against, to the hurt of their Persons *, nor yet to take up Arms against them, without and against their Authority: (except where there is a Law or Contract which allows Men so to do, and which is not in our Realm) yet doth it not follow that, (because we are to be subject to the Higher Powers; we must so far submit to their private and illegal Orders, and that even against their publick Laws, as not to bring their Ministers to just punishment for acting by the one, against the other, so long as we can thus support our actions by Legal Authority; and so long as even their Laws and Courts will give us Redress; and that because we do not hereby oppose them,

* See Socrates Hist. Eccles. Lib. 2. cap. 12, 13, 27. Grot. de jure Belli Lib. 1. cap. 1. sect. 9. Lib. 1. cap. 4. sect. 7. † Rom. 13. 4. ‡ Lib. de jure Belli cap. 4. sect. 4. † Acts 16. 37. Acts 22. 25. Acts 25. 10, 11. * 1 Sam. 16. 9. 2 Sam. 1. 14. Etiam in tali periculo Regis personæ parcendum, Grot. 1. Lib. de jure Belli cap. 4. sect. 7.

as the *Higher Powers*; nor indeed do we *all* against, but rather we *obey*, their chiefest Orders and Rules, as to us: The Laws of the Land being no *less* the Laws of the Higher Powers, Than they are the Laws of the People.

But now, though we pay *Subjection* to, rather than Resist them, when we thus seek to their allowed and Establish'd Law, and also to their own executive Power for the Grievances; (occasion'd by the illegal Proceedings of their Ministers against such *Laws*;) yet it is not to be subject to them, if *because* of such Proceedings, and the want of *help* against them by the Courts or Sword of such Powers, we therefore of *our selves*, presume to take up the Sword, and Levy War against them; but rather this is directly to resist and oppose them, not only in a way disallow'd by such Powers, as to *themselves*, but also as to *their Laws* and those of their *Nation*, as I shall shew in this Discourse.

By *Subjection* then to the *Higher Powers* as those which are Supreme † in any State or Government, (whether Monarchical, Aristocratical, or Democratical, I take it to be meant either the active Performance of their lawful Commands, or else submitting to the Evils or Penalties they lay upon us, *without* taking up Arms or Levying War against them, where we cannot avoid or escape such Evils by legal Ways or Means; and which *Submission* (in our common Phrase) is call'd *Passive Obedience*, or *Non Resistance*; and which we may be said to practice, when we not only keep to such Obedience that we may lawfully pay, but also submit to their Government, without illegal Resistance, at the same time we suffer wrongfully by them.

And that the Word and Nature of *Subjection* doth thus contain this *Submission*, is Evident from the Words of St. Peter in his First Epistle, 2 Chapter, ver. 18, 19, 20. when however the Opinion of Grotius ‡, and also our Church, || (That they are no less applicable to *Subjects* than they are to *Servants*;) may be doubted by some; yet do they prove, that the Duty of *Subjection* implieth the patient bearing of *wrongful* and undeserved *Sufferings*: *Servants be subject to your Masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the Froward; for this is Thank-worthy, if a Man for Conscience towards God endure grief, Suffering wrongfully: For*

† For so not only the Word, *ὑπεράνω* in the Original signifieth the Powers that are above, or have more than others, that hold above, excel or are the Chief and at the top to others; But the Word, *ὑποτάξω* is render'd in another place *Supreme*, 1 Pet. 2. 13. whether it be to the King as *Supreme*.
‡ De jure Belli Lib. 1. cap. 4. Sect. 4. || See 1st Homily against Rebellion, p. 164.

Passive Obedience, &c.

what glory is it, if when ye are buffeted for your faults, ye take it patiently? But when ye do well and suffer for it, ye take it patiently: This is acceptable with God. By which Words it plainly appears, that Subjection (among other Instances.) Consisteth in a bearing of these Evils with patience which we cannot Lawfully escape, tho' at the same time they are wrongfully laid upon us, even for well-doing.

Nor let it be thought absurd, That this Subjection to the Higher Powers is call'd by us *Passive Obedience*; since it is not only said that Christ *Learn'd* or *Fulfilled*, *Obedience by the things he Suffer'd*; * and his *drinking the Cup of Sufferings* (together with his dying) is call'd *the doing of God's Will* †; but because it is an equal if not a more difficult and glorious Work or Instance of Obedience to suffer, than to *obey*, as we ought; especially when by Suffering according to God's Will, and as it is requir'd, we also pay our Obedience to that Order, which thus enjoyns us to suffer.

And thus having shewed what it is to be subject to the Higher Powers, and how Subjection includes in it the Duty of *Passive Obedience* or Non-Resistance, I proceed to the 2d Head, viz. That the Duty of Subjection to the Higher Powers is not only a *Christian Duty*, agreeable to the *Laws and Practice of Christ* and his *Apostles*, To the *Principles and Practice of the Primitive Church*, but likewise it is agreeable to the particular *Laws of this Realm*, as well as *Doctrine of our Church*.

Now that it is a *Christian Duty*, tho' it might be inferr'd from the Obligation which is laid upon *Bishops and Ministers*, to put Men in mind that they be subject to *Principalties* ‡; yet need we no further or plainer direction for it, than this of the Text §, in which it is required (*without exception of Persons or their Circumstances*) *Let every Soul be subject to the Higher Powers, &c.* and which Words tho' they do not require us to be subject to those who are not the Higher Powers, upon point of Conscience; and tho' they do not oblige me to be a Slave, because I owe Subjection; yet do they not only prove, that whilst any are our Higher Powers, there is Subjection due to them; but in that these Words forbid *Resistance* to them, They also shew that the Subjection due to, cannot consist with the *Resisting* of them, but rather it consists in a *submitting to*, under wrongful Suffering by, them: Than in a *Resisting* of them by illegal Ways, or which we are not allow'd to take by the *Laws of God or Man*: And what shall I add more upon this Argument? When however it is a question with some, whether the Higher Powers remain such,

* Heb. 5. 8. † Mat. 26. 42. Heb. 10. 8. 9. 10. ‡ Titus 3. 1. § Rom. 13. 1. if

if they Command or insist unjust Things, yet cannot it be suppos'd otherwise from the Text; but that *if*, or *whilst* any continue the Higher Powers, it is a Declaration without Exception, *be that resisteth them, resisteth the Ordinance of God.* Tho' they be evil Men, Pagans or Persecutors, They being such in St. Paul's time; nor can any other Interpretation be put upon them, either in Law or Equity, to the contrary, especially when, besides that to take these Words of the Text in this large Sense, or as forbidding Resistance in general is not contrary to any other Gospel Rule: There are also other Texts to the same purpose, which shew this Duty of Subjection to be a Christian Duty. For adly, That it is a Christian Duty, will also appear from the Direction of St. Peter, to the scatter'd Christians (through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, and Asia:) that as they should not use their liberty for a cloak of maliciousness; so they should submit themselves to the King as Supreme *; Tho' he, who was then King, was a Nero, or (as St. Paul calls him) a Lion †: But 3dly, That we may not be without the Direction of Christ as to this Doctrine, we shall also find, that however Peter drew his Sword in defence of his Master; yet was not his behaviour therefore allow'd by Christ; but rather he was exhorted to put up his Sword again into its place, with this amongst other Arguments: For all they that take the Sword shall perish by the Sword ‡; which Words although they do not forbid the use of the Sword by them whose Office it is to bear it †, yet, even according to the Interpretation of them by Calvin and the Assembly of Divines; they disallow the use of it by private Persons, either without warrant from the Laws of God and Men, or against those who are Invested with publick Authority: Nor is it only Calvin's Inference from these Words of Christ **, That we should be cautious, lest we repel our Enemies by taking up Arms against those, who even unjustly provoke us, save where our Laws and publick Rights permit us so to do; * but even by Grotius's allowance, this was one of those Texts by which the Christians in Ancient times concluded the Practice of Non-Resistance to the Higher Powers, as their Duty.

4thly, That which yet further proves the Duty of Subjection aforementioned to be a Christian's Duty, and agreeable to the Laws of Christ, is this, viz. their Characters and Office.

And here, tho' I might enlarge this Argument, by shewing the Characters, which not only our Church-Canons and Acts of Parliament give them, viz. Supreme, and Sovereigns, next

* 1 Pet. 2. ver. 16. 18, 19, 20. † 2 Tim. 4. 17. Lightfoot's Harmon. ad Annum Neronis 11. & Christi 65. Joseph de Bello judaic. Lib. 2. Cap. 24. ‡ Mat. 26. 52. John 18. 11. † Rom. 13. 4. ** See Annot. on John 18. 11. * See 1. Lib. de jure Belli Cap. 4. Sect. 7.

and under Christ, Supreme Heads and Governours †. Yea, tho' to these I might, add also the Titles given them by the Primitive Christians, God's *Vicegerents*, *Minors only to God*; * *accountable to none but God*: Yet is it enough to consider their *Character* and *Office* set forth in the Scripture, Thus not to insist upon those Texts where Kings are call'd the *Lord's anointed* ‡, it is not only said of the Higher Powers. That they are God's *Ministers*, and being *his Ordinance*, are not to be *Resisted*; but it is their *Office to bear the Sword* †, and consequently as it is not the *Right of Subjects to take it up without* their Commission or Leave, and much less to take it up *against* them; so it is not to be suppos'd, (that being *Supreme*,) they will allow *those* who are *Subjects to*, to take up Arms *against* them; and who if they have a *Legal Power* to curb and restrain their Princes are not in that *their Subjects*, but rather their *Higher Powers*.

And as the Duty of Subjection in the Sense forementioned, is agreeable to the Laws of Christ and his Apostles, but *no where* Condemn'd or *disallow'd* by them as such; so is it agreeable to the Practice of Christ and the Primitive Christians. And First, as to Christ, tho' he doth not deny * himself to be a King as *he was the Christ*; yet to prove his Life upon Earth to be a State of Subjection to the Higher Powers, *as he was the Son of Man* and in a suffering State upon Earth, it is not only said of him that he *allowed and paid Tribute* †, but we also find, that however he was *falsly accus'd to Pilate*, as an Enemy to *Caesar*; yet did he *submit* to his unjust Sentence, that the *Scriptures might be fulfilled*: And by which, he shewed that however the ground of this Non-Resistance to his Sentence, in *Respect to himself*, was not the allowing of *Pilate's Right* ‡ to Condemn him to Death (but rather the *Decree and Will of God* that he should suffer when *his Hour was come* to that end;) yet is he an Example to us thereby, That we are not to resist when its *God's Will* we should suffer the illegal Oppressions of the Higher Powers; and which is *then* his Will, that we shall *not lawfully* escape, if we *can't* escape them, *without Sin*, or doing Evil to that End. Nor is there any reason to suppose, that it is allow'd by Christ for Christians to bear Arms and Levy War against the Higher Powers, when *those* illegally invade *their Rights* and oppress them; because it is said by Christ, when his Hour of Suffering drew nigh, *But now he that hath a Purse, let him take it, and likewise his Scrip, and he that hath no Sword let*

† Canons 36. 55. 25. H. 8 Cap. 21. * Tertullian ad Scapulam. ‡ 1 Sam. 24. 6. 2 Sam. 1. 14. † Rom. 13. 4. * John 18. 37. † Mat. 27. 27. ‡ See Bishop Burnet's Sermon, on Rom. 13. 5. p. 25.

him sell his Garment and buy one || : For, as when upon *their* mistake of his meaning, by these Words, the Disciples produce'd, or procur'd *two Swords*, he tells them *it is enough*; (which could scarcely be said of those *two Swords*, as to *their* own sufficiency, to defend him and them against the Multitude that came against him, any more than it could be said, that *it was enough*, though there were no Swords) so is it not to be suppos'd, that by *these* Words, or by the Order for *buying Swords*, he call'd them to take up Arms in his Defence; when (besides his Declaration to Pilate, that *his Kingdom was not of this World* †; and consequently there was no need for his Servants to *fight* for him, as there would have been, had his Kingdom *been of this World*) his Reproof of St. Peter, for the use of the Sword, (tho' in his Defence) is a plain Proof, that he did not call or require his Disciples, by the Words afore-mention'd, to take up Arms in his Defence; but rather, by the order of providing Purses and Swords at that time, he both signifies the great Dangers that he and his Disciples were to meet with; and also, the Power he had over the Sword, to smite, as well as to heal, had it been proper then to use it: And therefore, tho' upon the irregular use of it by St. Peter (for which he was reprov'd) he said, *suffer it Thus far*, that thereby he might not only shew his Power, as well as Goodness, in healing the High-Priest's Servant, whose Ear Peter had cut off, but that the Scripture might be fulfilled, which saith, *and he was reckoned amongst the Transgressors*. †; yet how far he was from the exercise of his own Power, and how much farther from the exercise of any unlawful way of resisting his Enemies, is declar'd by St. Peter, of whom he gives us this Character; That though, or when he suffered unjustly, yet he *threatned not*, but rather *committed his Cause to him who judgeth Righteously* *. And as the Duty of Subjection is agreeable to the Doctrine and Practice of Christ, so was it no less the Practice, than the Doctrine of the Apostles and the Primitive Church. And, first, as to the Apostles, it is to be observed, That however they were enabled to *work Miracles*, and to inflict Death and other Punishments by a Word, † when lawful and necessary so to do; yea, tho' they fail'd not to defend and justify their Religion, and themselves, before Kings and Rulers, with great Courage and Boldness, in Words; and also they were not to be terrify'd and perverted, either by their Threatnings or Persecutions; yet still did they *no more* rebel under Bonds and Per-

|| Luke 22. 36, 38. † John 18. 36. † See Assemb. Annot. Calvin's Harmon. Lightf. Hor. Heb. on Luke 22. 38. * 1 Pet. 2. 23. † Acts 13. 11. See St. Chrysost. on Mat. 10. 16.

secutions, than they did *things worthy of them*; They would not (it is true) omit or act against their Duty to God, to fulfil the Orders of Men; yet did they not therefore take up Arms, or allow Resistance, because of Persecution; but rather they rejoiced that *they were counted worthy to suffer for Christ* †; and as St. Paul declares, *they even gloried in Tribulations* ||.

And as the Apostles (especially St. Peter and St. Paul) were recorded Patterns, as well as Preachers of Non-Resistance: So was it no less the Practice of the Primitive Church for several Ages; even no less, than under Ten Persecutions one after another.

And tho', to this Purpose, I might not only lay before you the several Instances quoted by Dr. Hickes, in his Book call'd *Jovian* *, and by the late Mr. Kettlawell †; but I might lay before you several notable Instances of it, recorded by Grotius and Bishop Burnet; yet shall I have the less need so to do, since those, who deny it to be a Duty now, do allow, that it was practis'd at first by the Primitive Christians; 'Because, say they, besides, That they Then suffer'd by, and not against the Laws of those Times; they also were but few and defenceless.

But now, however, to lessen the Obligation of Men to this Duty, in these Days, some have endeavour'd also to eclipse the Glory of its Practice by the Primitive Christians, by pretending, 'That tho' they practis'd Passive Obedience, it was only because they suffer'd by, and not against Law; and because they were forced to practice it against their Wills; and that had they the Power (as Christians now have in some Nations) they would have resisted the Higher Powers, when oppress'd by them;) — yet will it sufficiently appear, That they not only practis'd that part of Subjection, which is call'd Passive Obedience, when they were able, and had sufficient Power to resist, but also when they were persecuted, and suffer'd even contrary to Law.

And, first, it will appear that they practis'd this Subjection, when they were able, and had sufficient Power to resist; when tho' at first the Church of Christ was but a little Flock ‡, yet in a short time it became a considerable Part of the Roman Empire; and especially so much did the Word of God increase and prevail, in, or about the latter part of the 2d, and the beginning of the 3d Century, that the Christians became a great, if not the greatest Part of those who dwelt in the Cities and most populous Places of the Empire; and yet, tho' they

† Acts 5. 41. || Rom. 5. 3. * Ch. 8. † See Christianity the Doctrine of the Cross, Ch. 4. ‡ Luke 12. 32.

might either have *saved*, or, *sold their Lives dear* by Resistance, *Tertullian* Apologizeth for them, that however, they were *able*, and had *Learn'd* to suffer, yet *not to rebel*, or take up Arms for their Religion: ' If we Christians (saith he writing to the Heathens) should become your publick Enemies, or *secret Revengers* for the wrongs we receive, should we want *Force* or *Number* to support it? We exceed the *Moors*, the *Marcomons*, the *Parthians*, or any other single Nation in the World; we are but of *Yesterday*, and yet we have fill'd your Places, your Cities, Islands, Castles, Corporations, Councils, Tribes, Companies, Palace, Senate, and Markets; and we have left you nothing to enjoy alone but your Temples. Now we who so willingly lay down our Lives, are we not thereby *fitted*, and *prepared to fight*, tho' we were inferior to you in *Number*, if our Religion did not rather oblige us, to suffer Death than to *assist* it? Yea, we might *without Arms* or Resistance, or even by a bare Disagreement with you, and by the Envy of a Separation very much endanger you: For if so great a Part of the Empire, as we are, should break it self from the Rest, and retire into remote Corners of the World, it would certainly *confound* your Dominions, to *lose* so many Subjects, (be their Quality what it will;) when our very departure from you, would be a severe Punishment; and the *Desolation* and Silence we should leave behind, would strike you with Horror and Amazement; you would be forced to seek for new Subjects to supply our places, and perhaps we should leave you more Enemies, than Subjects or Defenders*; And yet notwithstanding that the Christians were thus *numerous*, and *Potent* in *Tertullian's* Time, he adds further, That however we are *able* to revenge our selves upon you, *if we would*, yet are we *not* for Levying War or taking up Arms against our Emperour's ‖, That however, there were *not only* several Rebellions against them, by others, and with whom they might have joyn'd, yet doth *Tertullian* Challenge their Judges to give one instance, where the Christians had either taken up Arms against their Emperours, or had sided with the Rebels. Who were they that laid wait for *Caesar* in his Country Recess with *Sigerius* and *Parthenius*? Or who Conspir'd against *Domitian*? Whence were the Adherents of *Cassius*, *Niger*, and *Albinus*? Were they not from your selves, Heathen Romans, but no Christians? All which Apology (saith *Grotius* upon it) † as it would have been im-

part

* See Apology, Cap. 35. 37. 39. & p. 668 Edit. ~~1681~~ Octavo. ‖ Cave's Primitive Christianity, p. 443. † Grot. de jure Belli, Lib. 1. Cap. 4. Sect. 7.

prudent and *impudent* in *Tertullian* to have urged, had it been true or known to the contrary, that the Christians *did Resist* or take up Arms against *Persecuting Emperours*; so doth it shew, that their subjection *to*, did not proceed merely from want of Power to Resist, *them*.

Furthermore, In his Treatise to *Scapula*, he adds, That however the Christians were so numerous, yet, *saith he*, ' We still Act with modesty and silence ; and tho' known, yet it chiefly, for our *Patience* and Reformation: It is true, we are not without *Reflections* upon us, as if we were *Enemies* to the Majesty of the Emperour, yet never could the Christians be found like to *Albinus*, *Niger*, or *Cassius*, the Raisers of War or Rebellion against him; it being no less than the Property of a *Christian*, to be an *Enemy* to none, and much less to be so to the *Emperor*, who knowing him to be *Ordain'd of God*, must therefore be *obliged* to Love, Reverence and Honour him, and even to desire *his Safety*, with that of the whole Empire. Nay, so far are we Christians from Rebellion against, That we even *respect* and *Worship* him so far as it is *Lawful*, for us, or *expedient* for him, as one who is in the next place to God, and as above all others to us, when, as to us, only below God.

And that all the foregoing Declaration might not be Construed as *Flattery*, or the Effects of *Fear*, he adds, ' That it would be a great mistake, if *Scapula* (or any else) should take it to be Written, rather for the sake and safety of the Christians, Than from a Sense of Duty : For we, *saith he*, are even ready not only to enter the Lists with all your Cruelties, but even to fly upon them ; being more pleas'd (as for our own sakes,) to be *Condemn'd*, than *Quitted* by you ; and therefore we have sent this Book, not having any fear for our selves, but for you, and our Enemies ; and again we do not terrify, because we are afraid of you ; but because we admonish you for your own safety, that you do not fight against God, in persecuting of us. All which, and more that *Tertullian* urges, as it is a Proof that Non-Resistance was suppos'd to be a Duty in his Days ; so have I insisted on his Testimony the more, not only because it is allow'd by *Grotius* (one whom the Advocates for Resistance do often Quote as a Champion on their side) but because the Temper and Practice of *Tertullian*, was far from that of the *Scycophant* or *Courtier* : However, That we may not depend only upon the Words and Behaviour of *Tertullian*, I proceed to other Testimonies and Patterns of Subjection in the Primitive Times. And here not to insist up-

on the *Words and Practice* of the *Theban Legion* at which some are so much offended; (tho' they are not only recorded by *Eusebius*, Bishop of *Lyons*, in the 5th Century, but they are also allowed by *Grotius* *, and by the present Bishop *Fowler* **: :) We have also this Doctrine and Practice set before us by *St. Cyprian*, and who also assures *Demetrianus*, That however the Christians had Numbers *more than enough* for Resistance, yet when we are apprehended and suffer the most unjust violence, we do not make any such Resistance, nor do we revenge it †.

But to proceed; tho' great and cruel were the *Persecutions* of the Christians by *Dioclesian*, and about whose time the *Theban Legion* were said to suffer by *Maximian*, (being Fetter'd by the Doctrine of Non-Resistance;) †† Yea, tho' not only so many were the Martyrs in his Days, that Bishop *Burnet* affirmeth the Number of them in one Province to be no less than 800000 ‡, but even *Eusebius* likewise tells us, That the Christians were then so many that they were scarcely to be number'd *: and upon the account of which the above nam'd *Dioclesian* was afraid to begin his Persecution against them for a time: Yet still we find, that notwithstanding their great Numbers, as well as Sufferings, tho' they had Learned to suffer, they had not been taught, nor had they Learned to Rebel and take up Arms against the Higher Powers. Again, that great were the Numbers, as well as *Persecutions* of the Christians when they practiced Non-Resistance, tho' it may be proved from their Behaviour and Sufferings under *Galerius* and others ‡, yet it is remarkably Evident in the times of *Julian* the *Apostate*; who, as he gives this account of the Christians, That they were Enemies to Sedition upon the account of their Religion, and to whom he return'd this Answer, that their Religion requir'd them to suffer, when they sued to him for Mercy *: so it is plain, that however, they suffer'd and Rebelled not, yet did they not thus submit purely for want of force; when besides, the other Christians, even the *Roman Armies* were chiefly Christians: And hence we find, that however *Julian* was a Heathen in his Heart, even when he

See *Cave's Primitive Christianity*, p. 431. 1 Lib. de jure Belli Cap. 4: Sect. 7. ** See his *Design of Christianity*, Cap. 16.

† See Ep. ad Demtr. p. 192. Ox. Edit.

†† Grot. Lib. 1 de jure Belli Cap. 4.

Sect. 7. ‡ Ibid. Sect. 8.

§ See Ser. Rom. 13. 5. p. 31.

† Lib. 8 Cap. 1. 4. 6. 8.

‡ Euseb. Lib. 8. Cap. 14. Eccles. Hist. Lactant. de morte Persecut.

* See *Socrat. Eccles. Hist. Lib. 3. Cap. 14.*

was first made *Cæsar*; yet if he did not feign himself to be a Christian during the Life of *Constantius* ||, he at least us'd the *Orthodox* with kindness for a time; lest otherwise either his own Army should *Refuse*, him as Emperor: And tho' indeed it is not denied, but he afterwards turn'd a bitter Enemy to Christ and his Religion; yet still it was also seen, that after *all* his *Arts* as well as *Force* (to pervert his own Army) he could not effect his Design; but even *half* of it continued Christians, or (according to *Grotius*) † they were still the *greater* part. And tho' it is not denied, that by one means or other, a great Number outwardly turn'd Heathens, yet was not this their Turning, either *hearty* or *lasting*; as appears from their Answer to *Jovian*, when he refus'd to command them, if Heathens, viz. That however, they had been deceiv'd by *Julian*, yet in their Hearts they were Christians.

In short, it is not only affirm'd that in his Days the Number of those who refus'd to Sacrifice was so great, that the *Magistrates* were unable to take it; and there were but few comparatively who wou'd Sacrifice ||, but we also find, that after *Julian's* Death, both *Jovian* and *Valentinus* were chosen to be Emperors, altho' Christians; and that even by *Julian's* Army: By all which it appears; that however, their Armies against him were those of *Prayers and Tears only* *, nor did they attempt any others; and tho' they took up the Sword for, but not against him; yet was not this their Passive Obedience for want of a *Right* and *Will* to Resist; when, besides their great Numbers, they had also such brave *Commanders* to *lead* them; but so it was that however, not only *several* of their *Commanders* were turn'd out of their *Posts*, but *others* of them were put to *Death*, viz. *Juveninus* and *Maximus* †. Yet it is no where said, that because thus Persecuted, they took up Arms against *Julian*, as by so doing is to be meant of *Levying War*; or the use of the Sword; for so I add, because tho' it is said of *Juveninus* and *Maximus*, That they were for *taking up Weapons* against him; yet do *these* also declare, what those *Weapons* were, viz. not Carnal, but Spiritual: For

Force,
but

|| Sozom. Lib. 5. Cap. 5. Cap. 2. & 3. Theodor. Lib. 3. cap. 3. 4.

† 1 Lib. de jure Belli Cap. 4. Sect. 5. Cave's *Primitive Christianity*, p. 441. Theodor. 4. Lib. Cap. 1. Sozom. Lib. 6. Cap. 3.

|| Sozom. Lib. 5. Cap. 15.

* Greg. Juvect. 75. Grot. de jure Belli, Lib. 1. Cap. 4. Sect. 5.

† Theodor. Lib. 3. Cap. 8. & 15.

we have no need of Darts and Arrows, and other boldly Armour; but our Tongues, by which we are to confess Christ, are sufficient Arms for us *. But to proceed, as by what St. † Chrysostom has written upon Mat. 10. Chap. ver. 16. and upon my Text, we find how far he is from allowing the Higher Powers to be Resisted; so is no less than the Doctrine of St. Ambrose, Quoted by Grotius ‖, That he cou'd grieve, and mourn, and that his Tears were Arms to him; but otherwise he cou'd not, he ought not to Resist, and therefore tho' Valens cruelly oppress'd the Orthodox in his time, yet would he not therefore allow, that he shou'd be resisted by Maximus his Forces †.

Nay, lastly, Not to insist upon what St. Cyril has written upon this Subject *, we find the Doctrine and Practice of Passive Obedience, to be no less than that of St. Augustin's also; and which as it is urg'd to be his, even by Grotius himself; so are his Words remarkable to this purpose, when he tells us of the City of Christ, that Tho' it could have set out such Troops of great Nations against the impious Persecutions, yet did it not fight for their Temporal Safety, but rather that they might obtain Eternal, they suffer'd all without resistance; they were Bound, Imprison'd, Beaten, Tortur'd, Burnt, Torn in pieces, Slain, and yet they multiplied: But, amidst all this, they wou'd not fight, for their Temporal Safety, but even Con-temn'd it, in Respect to their Saviour †.

And what shall I add more concerning the Practice of Passive Obedience by the Primitive Church, even when it had Power and Arms on its side? since not only Grotius ‖ himself declares it as a Reflection upon the Honour and Practice of the Primitive Christians to affirm, that they practiced it only, because they had not Force and Power to Resist; but so much was it their Practice, that the present Bishop Burnet denys any Father, or Assembly of Church-men to have taught, maintain'd, or justify'd, any Rebellious Doctrines or Practices, till about a Thousand Years after Christ; but rather he affirmeth that the Doctrine of Resisting the Supreme Authority, and especially of deposing and rebelling against it, as Lawful so to do, was Originally Popish; chiefly broach'd at first in the 11th Century by Gregory the Seventh, and afterwards

* Mountague on Greg. Juvet. 123.

† Chrysost. on Juven. & Maxim. Jovian, p. 110.

‖ Grot. de jure Belli, Lib. 1. Cap. 4. Sect. 5.

* In locum Johannis de gladio Petri, Grot. de jure Belli, 1 Lib. Cap. 4. Sect. 7.

† Lib. 22. de Civit. Dei, Cap. 6.

‖ 1 Lib. Cap. 4 Sect. 7.

establish'd by the third Canon of the *Laterane Council* *; And now how *this* agrees with what has been deliver'd in a late Sermon, that even the Doctrine of Passive Obedience was hammer'd out of the pious Forge of the Church of Rome †, I leave Mr. Stoughton himself to consider.

Nor indeed is it any just Objection to prove the Doctrine and Practice of the abovenam'd Subjection to be the *less* Primitive, because under the Persecution of *Licinius* there were several *Bishops*, as well as Christians, who invoc'd the help of *Constantine* for their Relief, and by which they were deliver'd; and also *Licinius* was defeated; if we consider that in appealing to *Constantine* for help, they did not appeal to one who was not their Higher Power; but rather to one who was equally their Emperour with, and even Superiour to, *Licinius* ‡; who tho' a Colleague with, and Coadjutor to *Constantine*, was not only Subject to him, but even bound by him not to Persecute the Christians; and therefore for the violation of his Oath *, in this and other particulars, as one Subject to *Constantine's* Power, he was punish'd, and put to Death: And thus have I at large shew'd that the Duty of Subjection (even as by it is meant Passive Obedience or Non-Resistance) to the Higher Powers is not only agreeable to the Laws and Practice of Christ and his Apostles, but to the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Church; and that when they were not but a few and defenceless People, but when they had Power and Force to Resist; and when as I proceed to shew in the next place they were Persecuted and Oppress'd by the Higher Powers, Contrary to the Laws of Men as well as God.

When tho' it is Confess'd that at the first planting of Christianity in the Roman Empire the Professors of it had no Laws to defend them, as Christians: yet is it no less to be proved, That tho' not as Christians, yet as Subjects of it in common with others, they had various Laws to protect them; and tho' for full Satisfaction in this matter I might Refer my Reader to the Treatise, call'd *Christianity the Doctrine of the Cross*, and in which this is clearly proved by manifold Instances; yet sufficient it is here to insist only upon these Following.

And first, not to insist upon the Proof of it by other Testimonies, That it was one of the Roman Laws, that no Ro-

* See Ser. on Rom. 13. Cap. 5. p. 31.

† See Ser Jan. 31st. 1708.

‡ Βασιλεὺς μεγάλῃ καὶ κοινῇ δουλείᾳ τῆς τιμῆς.

* Euseb. Lib. 10, Cap. 8. ib. Cap. 9. p. 395. 399. 433. per Yalcf. Edit. Mogunt.

Man should be Scourged or punish'd with Rods Uncondemn'd, may be inferr'd from the Words of St. Paul, *Acts* 14. 37. *Acts* 22. 23. and yet is it not plain, that however St. Paul had once the benefit of this Law, that for the most part it was the common portion of the Christians to be Beaten and Scourg'd, even when not Legally Condemn'd? And thus, *Tertullian* tells *Scapula*; That tho' the Legal Design of Torturing Men by Scourges, was not to make Men deny after they had confess'd the suppos'd Crime; (This being against Law, and the Design of such Scourging) but rather the Design of it was to find out the Crime or Fact, according to that of *Acts* 22. 24. yea, tho' it was only the Design of the Law by it, (*nocentes Confessos damnare, negantes autem ad Tormenta revocare,*) To Torture Men that they might Confess; yet as he alledgeth, so much were the Christians Persecuted, Contrary to this Law *, That they were not only Scourged and tortur'd for Confessing themselves, but for not denying themselves to be Christians *.

2dly. Another Law contrary to which the Christians were Persecuted, was this; that as no Man shou'd be Condemned, but upon Tryal, so he shou'd have leave to speak for himself; and accordingly it was not only permitted to St. Paul by *Agrippa* and *Felix*, That he might not speak for himself †, But *Festus* tells the Jew, that it was not the manner (or Custom) of the Romans to deliver any Man to dye, till he have his Accusers Face to Face, and he have Liberty to answer for himself, concerning the Crimes laid against him; but yet tho' it is plain, that the Christians (as Romans) had this Priviledge, and which was allowed to St. Paul; yet there were many who cou'd not enjoy it; when tho' Charg'd indeed with other Crimes yet, as *Tertullian* shews, it was enough to condemn them unheard, if they did but bear the Name of Christians. Yea, this was enough to make them say, To the Lions with the Christians.

And what shall I add more? When tho' it was Law, that if any Man had wrong done to him, he might Implead those who did it by Law, and seek for Redress; yet were the Christians so far from being allow'd this Priviledge, That rather others were Encourag'd in their Injustice and Cruelties to them; and particularly in the times of *Nero*, *Severus*, *Gallienus*, and *Dioclesian*; but especially it is to be observ'd in the Reign of *Julian*, That however, there were several Laws

* Videtis ergo quomodo ipsi vos contra Mandata faciatis ut Confessos negare cogatis ad *Scapul*.

† *Acts* 24. 10. *Acts* 26. 1. *Acts* 25. 16.

made in favour of the Christians by *Constantine* and *Constantinus*; yet after *Julian* had Sate upon the Throne for some time, he wou'd not allow them to Enjoy their Legal Privileges; but rather they were most illegally Treated, if not by the express Order, yet by the Connivence and Approbation of *Julian*; and yet, (as I have shew'd) we do not find, that the Christians of that Age because such, did either take or allow Offensive or Defensive Arms against him.

And thus having proved that the Duty of Subjection to the Higher Powers is not only a Christian Duty, agreeable to the Laws and Practice of Christ and his Apostles, but to those of the Primitive Christians; and that not only when they were Few and punish'd by the Laws of the Empire, but when they had Power to Resist, and when they were Persecuted contrary to Law; having thus, I say, Treated upon the former part of this 2d Head, I proceed now to the latter Part, and from it to shew, that this Duty of Subjection is no less agreeable to the particular Laws of this Realm, than to the Doctrines of our Church. And first, how agreeable it is to the Doctrine of our Church, as it is to be proved from its Canons and Articles, wherein it is affirm'd, that *The King's or Queens Majesty is the Supreme Governour of this Kingdom, and that their Power is the highest under God; unto whom, by God's Laws, the People of it, do owe most Loyalty and Obedience before, and above all other Powers and Potentates**, so do we not only read in its Homilies, (and unto which all Church of England Ministers, at their Institution into Livings are requir'd to Subscribe) That Subjection is due to the Higher Powers by the Laws of God; but therein also it is prohibited to take up Arms even against an Evil Prince; as may be seen in its 2d Homily of Obedience †, and in the Homilies against Rebellion.

Nay, Lastly, tho' I need not urge any other particular Man's Judgment in this matter, when the Doctrine of Non-Resistance hath been so well Stated and Defended by the late Archbishop Usher ‡, yet is it not only observable, That there have been as many, if not more Sermons Printed upon this Subject; and in Defence of it by Church of England Ministers (Men Famous for their Zeal against Popery, no less than for their great Learning and Stations in our Church) Than have been Publish'd upon any other particular Subject; but that we may not think this Doctrine peculiar only to the Church of Eng-

* Article 37. Capons 1st and 36th.

† Page 65. 66.

‡ Of Obedience p. 109. 111. 134. 145. 146. 147. 150. 153. 157.

land Men in these latter Days, we also find it declar'd as a true Doctrine by many of the Nonconformists to it; and here not to depend upon Arch-Bishop Bramhall's Character or Account concerning their Opinion in this Matter *, it is no less also than the Declaration of the Commissioners at the Savoy in their Petition to King Charles the II. That tho' we are not to do, what they command if God forbids it, Yet if our Governours Command what God forbiddeth, we must patiently submit to Suffering, and every Soul must be Subject to the Higher Powers for Conscience sake, and not Resist †: And as the Doctrine of Non-Resistance is a Church of England Doctrine, and such that is allowed by many Nonconformists, so is it no less agreeable to the particular Laws of this Realm. And here not to insist upon such Laws which have been Repeal'd since the late Revolution, particularly that which enjoyn'd this Declaration from Ministers, that it is not Lawful upon any pretence whatsoever, to take up Arms against the King, yet it is not only to be observ'd, that there is no one Act of Parliament which allows or authorizeth the taking up Arms against the King or Queen's Majesty of this Realm; but there are also sundry Acts and Laws against it; and which Laws were no less made by the People themselves, in their Representatives, than they were made Acts by Royal Authority. And here not to insist upon such former Acts which are still in Force, That to Levy War against the King or Queen of this Realm, or to be adherent to the King's Enemies, by aiding them, in this Realm, or else where, is High-treason; * and which is affirm'd without any Exception to it; I say, not to insist upon such former Acts, it is yet declar'd by an Act made in the 12th Year of King Charles II. †† That by the undoubted and Fundamental Law of this Kingdom, neither the Peers of this Realm, nor the Commons nor both together in Parliament, nor the People Collectively or Representatively, nor any other Persons whatsoever, ever had, have, hath, or ought to have any Coercive Power over the Persons of the Kings of this Realm. Nay further, so far have even our own Laws Establish'd the Doctrine of Non-Resistance, that by another Act made in the 13th Year of King Charles the II. ‡ it is therein Declar'd, that (however the Lords and Commons have a share in the making of Laws, yet) the sole Government, Command and Disposition of the Militia, and of all Forces by Sea and Land, and of all Forts and Places of strength is, and by the Laws of England, ever was, the undoubted Right of his Majesty and his Royal Predecessors, Kings and Queens of England; and that both or either of the Houses of Parliament,

* *Short Nonconformists*, A. D. 1661. p. 4. † 25. Ed. 3. Cap. 2. †† Cap. 30.

‡ See *Serpent Salve* 525. 526.

cannot, nor ought to pretend to the same; nor can, nor Lawfully may, raise or Levy any War Offensive or Defensive against his Majesty, his Heirs, or Lawful Successors: And as it is to be observ'd, that however, several other Acts were Repeal'd yet these two last mention'd are not Repealed; so tho' by an Act made in the first Year of King William, and Queen Mary, it is asserted; That the late King James did Abdicate the Government, and whereby the Throne became vacant; and tho' by the Representation therein made, it is declar'd to be the Right of the Subjects to Petition, and that the Subjects, which are Protestants, may have Arms for their Defence, suitable to their Conditions, and as allow'd by Law; yet is it not affirm'd, in the said Statute, that it was allow'd, by any foregoing Law to take up Arms against those who continue to be the Supreme Powers, but rather, (besides that the Deliverance receiv'd from Popery and Arbitrary Power, and the ascertaining of their Rights, mention'd in the said Declaration *, are ascrib'd to King William, as the Glorious Instrument of it) in the Act for preventing vexatious Suits, against such who acted in order to the bringing in their Majesties, or for their Service, there is also a Declaration to this Effect, viz. That whereas about the time of his Majesties glorious Enterprize for delivering this Kingdom from Popery and Arbitrary Power, and in aid and pursuance of the same, divers Lords, Gentlemen, and other good People well affected to their Country, did act as Lieutenants, and Deputy-Lieutenants, Justices of the Peace, or other Officers, tho' not sufficiently Authoriz'd thereunto, and did apprehend and put in Custody some Criminous and suspected Persons, and seize and use Horses, Arms and other things, and enter'd into the Houses and Possessions of several Persons, and Quarter'd Soldiers and others there; in which Proceedings some force and and violence and defect of Form was unavoidable, which in time of Peace and common Safety would not have been Warrantable; and also since their Majesties happy Accession to the Throne (by reason of the Wars and troubles rais'd and occasion'd by the Enemies of their Majesties and this Kingdom,) divers like matters and things have been done, all which were necessary and allowable in regard of the exigency of publick Affairs, and ought to be justified and the Parties concern'd therein indemnified, &c. Be it Enacted That all Prosecutions whatsoever and Judgments had thereupon, (if any be,) for any of the Premises, or any matter or thing, advised, commanded, appointed, or done in order to the bringing their Majesties to this Kingdom, or

* To which Demand of their Rights, they are particularly encourag'd by the Declaration of his Highness the Prince of Orange, as being the ONLY means of a full Redress, and Remedy therein.

' for their Service, or for the safety of the Government,
 ' are thereby discharged and made Void. Furthermore, as by
 the Act of King William aforementioned, it is recogniz'd and
 declar'd in Parliament, ' That King James the II. having ab-
 ' dicated the Government, and their Majesties having accepted
 ' the Crown and Royal Dignity, their said Majesties did be-
 ' come, were, and are, and of right ought to be, by the Laws
 ' of this Realm, their Sovereign Leige Lord and Lady, and to
 ' whose Royal Persons, the Titles, Regalities, Prerogatives,
 ' Powers, Jurisdictions, &c. to the same belonging and ap-
 ' pertaining are most fully, rightfully and intirely Invested, In-
 ' corporated, United and Annexed; so is it likewise to be ob-
 served, that however in the same Act several of the Peoples
 Liberties are declared and confirmed, yet is there not any Clause
 in the said Act, which either expresseth or allows them any
 Liberty to take up Arms against the said King William or
 Queen Mary, or against their Successors in Sovereignty; nor is
 there any Clause which Repeals the Statutes of King Charles
 aforementioned; it is true indeed, that by the Act of King
 William aforementioned, it is made a Law, that no Papist, nor
 one Marrying a Papist shall be King or Queen of this Realm,
 but rather shall be excluded, and for ever incapable to Inherit,
 Possess, and Enjoy the Crown and Government of this Realm, &c.
 or to have, use, exercise any Regal Power, Authority, or Ju-
 risdiction within the same. Nay, by the said Act it is declar'd,
 That the People of these Realms shall be, and are thereby ab-
 solved from their Allegiance to such Papists, or the Marryers
 of Papists (whilst such) as if they were naturally Dead: But
 now as it is not pretended by those, who Quote this Statute
 as a Virtual Repealing of the Statutes of King Charles II.
 aforementioned, that, they are Expressly Repeal'd by it; so is
 this not only far from being asserted therein, but far from
 being a Consequence, that because no Papist by the said Statute
 is to be the Sovereign of this Realm, or because there is no
 Subjection due to him (That is not or cannot be King whilst
 such) therefore it is allow'd to take up Arms, against those
 that are Lawful Kings and Queens of this Realm, and are not
 either Papists or married to such; but are Protestants and of
 the Church of England. In short, as it is no Superseding of
 the Statutes of King Charles the II. aforementioned, nor a tak-
 ing away of that Prerogative which is given or declar'd to
 the Kings and Queen of this Realm by the said Statutes, that
 there is a Law against the Inheriting of the Crown by Pa-
 pists, and that to such there is no Obligation for Subje-
 ction (and consequently not for any Passive Obedience) to
 them, unless our Kings and Queens should be Papists; so tho'
 it is not due to Papists, because (whilst the said Act is in Force)

they

they are not the Higher Powers nor Lawful Successors; yet still the Contents of them, are no less true concerning Queen Ann, than that the said Acts of King Charles were true as to him, even by the Act of Settlement it self; and which (as I have shewn) doth not destroy, but rather Confirms the Prerogative annexed to the Crown; amongst which (till Repeal'd) this by the Law is one, that no Persons in this Realm have any Lawful Power to raise, or make War Offensive or Defensive, against the King's Majesty, his Heirs or Lawful Successors. Since therefore there is not any liberty or allowance by our Laws, to take up Arms against the Kings or Queens of this Realm, as, or whilst, they are Sovereigns; but rather the Power of the Sword and Militia is in their hands, and that all Commissions, to raise War, are from them; it follows, that had the general Laws of Scripture or Nature otherwise left us at Liberty; yet we are still obliged by our own Laws not to take up Arms against them*; — especially since by our own Laws and Consent, we allow them to be Supreme and Sovereign, in these Realms. For lastly, That which proves the agreeableness of the Subjection aforementioned to the Laws of this Land, is the Supremacy and Sovereignty, which they receive thereby. And here not to mention all those former Laws, which are yet Unrepeal'd, and in which their Sovereignty and Supremacy, over all Persons in this Land, are declared and recogniz'd †, I add yet further, that however, the Lords and Commons are Sharers with our Kings and Queens in the Legislature, and making of Laws, (and without whose aid, and consent, there will want Taxes to support the Sword) yet are they not so in the Sovereignty and Supremacy; but rather both formerly, and since the Revolution, they confess and call themselves most Loyal and Dutiful Subjects, even when assembled in Parliament, as appears by their frequent Addresses as well as Laws.

And now, if even from our own Laws and Concessions, the Kings and Queens of this Land are Supreme and Sovereign, and all their People are their Subjects, it follows that being Subject to, they owe to their Sovereigns Subjection; and if they owe them Subjection they have not any Power to take up Arms against them, unless by any Contract or Law, it has been given to such Subjects to have the Liberty of so doing, to which yet (as I have shewn) they have no Right. It is confess'd indeed, That however, by the Laws of this Land, and from the Sense of their Sovereignty over us, we ought to pay to the Higher Powers of this Nation, that Subjection which is due to them, without tak-

* See Arch-Bp. Tillotson's Letter to Lord Russell, June 20. 1693.

† 24. H. 8. Cap. 12. 25. H. 8. Cap. 21. 1 Jacob. Cap. 1. 1. Will. and Mary Sess. 2d Cap. 2.

ing up Arms against them, whilst they continue our Sovereigns : Yet doth it not follow, that they may therefore make us Slaves, or tempt us to Resistance by unjust Proceedings; but rather they are to govern us like a *free People*, and as Subjects for our good * ; yet on the other hand, since, there is no Law or Contract which gives us the Liberty or Power to take up Arms against them (whilst Sovereigns) and since being our Sovereigns we are also their Subjects ; it follows, that (whilst such) we are not to take up Arms against them ; and which to do is not only contrary to the Duty, but the Notion of Subjection ; which denotes a being under another ; (he being not Subject to, but rather above, who has Power to call another to Account, or to punish him by the Sword :) And hence it is that tho' it be Essential to Supremacy, and Sovereignty (in whatever State it is placed,) that it be above and not to be Resisted by those, who are Subject to it †, yet it doth not follow that those have an irresistible, who want the Supreme Power : Nay, if by the Laws or Constitution of any Government, its Kings are either accountable to their Subjects, or to Persons delegated by them ; or, if Nominally the Higher Powers, they yet take it with Conditions and Compact of Resistance in such and such Cases, they are resistable, and that because in such Cases they are not Sovereigns and Supreme ; having others above them therein. Thus the Emperours of Germany (being chosen by Election and) taking the Imperial Crown with certain Conditions, of being restrain'd and oppos'd, by the Electors, according to the Laws of the Golden Bull ‡, are also said to be in some Cases Resistable ; And hence it was, that however Luther was, not for the taking up of Arms against the Emperour Charles the Vth, as supposing him to be a Supreme and absolute Sovereign ; nor would he enter into the League of Smalcold at first ; yet being convinced by the German Lawyers, That the said Emperour was not * such a Sovereign (but rather had taken the Government with Conditions of being oppos'd, in Case he shou'd act against the Law, call'd the Golden Bull,) he not

* Rom. 13. 4. † Habet hoc omne imperium quo Univerſa Civitas aliqua regitur ut fit Summum, viz. in ſui exercitio, à nullo homine tanquam Superiore dependens, &c. ſicut Ejusdem actus à nemine tanquam Superiore queant irriti reddi. Puffendorf de civ. Lib. 2 cap. 9. Summa autem illa dicitur (potestas) cujus actus alterius juri non ſubſunt, ita ut alterius voluntatis humanæ Arbitrio irriti poſſunt reddi ; Grot. de Jure Belli, Lib. 1. Cap. 3. Sect. 7.

‡ Apud Goldſtat Tom. 3 p. 429.

• Sleidan's Comment. Lib. 8. A. D. 1531. Lib. 17. A. D. 1546.

† Lex fundamentalis imperii Germanici, promulg. Norimberg, A. D. 1356 Sleid de Monarc. 312.

only approved of the said League, and wrote a Book against the two Mandates of Caesar; but it was upon this Account, that he was resisted by the then Duke of Saxony: But now however so far as any Kings are not Sovereign and Supreme, but take their Dominion with Conditions and Allowances of Resistance, they may be resisted in some Cases; yet it is not so, where by their own and their Subjects Laws, they are both declared and made Supreme, and where, by the same Laws their Subjects also are restrained from taking up Arms against them; and especially since these Laws (tho' far from being made with any Design, either to enslave the Parliaments that made them, or to make their own or other Mens Lives a Prey to the Lusts and Designs of evil Princes, even by the Concession of some that are offended at them) yet not only in the Letter, but in the Design and Equity of them, were Enacted to keep Subjects from raising such War and Rebellion against their Sovereigns in this Realm, as those were by the Effects of which it had so lately and remarkably suffered.

And now when the Doctrine of Subjection (as by it is meant Passive-Obedience or Non-Resistance) is not only a Christian Duty, confirmed by the Practice of the Primitive Church (and that long before Popery) but also is agreeable to our Laws, especially those, since the Reformation, it may be reasonably expected, that all those (Divines especially) who of late do condemn it as impious, and contrary to the fundamental Laws of this Land, would either shew clearer Proofs against it, from the Laws of Christ, than have been so often urged for it; or else that they would shew us some of those Acts of Parliament which forbid it; or which prove the taking up Arms against the Sovereigns of this Realm to be lawful; but if they cannot produce any Laws of Christ or this Realm, which require, or allow them to rebel, or take up Arms against the Kings and Queens of this Realm, they ought not only in Duty and Gratitude, to our Gracious Sovereign, and in Respect to our own Laws, but (I had almost added) in Respect to the Doctrine of Passive-Obedience, to be more sparing in their Censures of it; and that however they have other Exceptions to it, and fly to the Laws of Nature and Self-Defence (as separate from reveal'd Laws) they would yet have more Modesty than to condemn it, as unchristian, and contrary to the Laws of this Land, because of some worldl. Inconveniencies by it; and which as they are not a sufficient Reason to cancel its Legality and Obligation, so doth the Consideration and the answering of the said and other Objections, lead me to treat upon the next general Head, viz. not only to enquire into, but also to shew the Invalidity of, the chiefest Pleas and Objections against the Duty of Subjection.

3d. Head.

And

Obj. 1. And First, One great and common Objection which is urged by some against, is the *presumed* evil Consequences of it: When among other its evil Effects, *say they*, this is one, That if it be not a Doctrine destructive in it self to their Liberty and Properties, their Lives and Religion, yet it not only *tempteth* the Higher Powers (if wicked and tyrannical) to act illegally; but, if followed, it leaveth Subjects as a Prey, and defenceless; it being the same in the Event, with their being without Laws for the Security of Liberties and Properties, their Lives and Religion, if notwithstanding the said Laws, they are without the Liberty of defending them by Force of Arms, and to resist the said Higher Powers, when they illegally oppress them.

This, as it is a short Summ or Epitome of their Various Discourses concerning the ill Consequence of Passive Obedience, so in Answer to it I now affirm.

First, That however in the same way *Meekness, Patience, and Piety* do tend to make Men Preys to others, or in the same Sense that the wicked become worse by God's Mercy †, and long Suffering; in the same also, doth the Doctrine or Practice of Passive Obedience tend to make the Higher Powers to Act Illegally, and to be more Arbitrary and Cruel, viz. by an *ungrateful Abuse of them*; yet is not this therefore Reasonable or justifiable, but rather such Higher Powers are the more *inexcusable*, and obnoxious to Divine Vengeance.

But 2dly, Whereas it may be said, that *their* being the more inexcusable and obnoxious to Divine Vengeance, is no Relief or Cessation to the Evils of their Subjects, whilst suffer'd by them, I proceed to shew that this Doctrine of Subjection (call'd Passive Obedience) doth not necessarily render Men defenceless, if we consider the help which Subjects have against such evil Treatment, both from themselves and others: It is confess'd, that if it be God's Will and Purpose, either to try or punish such Subjects by illegal Oppressions, and he has appointed that they shall suffer to this end; in vain is their own, or the help of others to prevent; nor can they any more avoid them by Resistance, than by Passive Obedience.

But now however when it is God's Will that Judgments are to begin at his House ‖, and that his Disciples shall have Tribulation here, the said Will must be perform'd by or upon us, whether we submit to or Resist these, who are the Instruments of it; yet since such Subjects cannot ordinarily know, but it may be his Will only to threaten, and not to inflict, or it may

† Rom. 2. 4. 5. ‖ 1 Pet. 4. 17.

be also his Will, rather to *remove* and *prevent*, than *suffer* the Continuance of such illegal Oppressions; hence it is that they ought *not* to make themselves *more defenceless*, than God has made them, by their own Neglects; but rather they ought to use that Help which God and his Laws have propos'd to them; both from *themselves* and *others*; and which they also may have *without* any Contradiction to the Doctrine and Practice of Passive Obedience, as I proceed to prove: And here tho' I do not insist upon that *Temporary Restraint* to their illegal Proceedings, which the Higher Powers may *meet with*, both from the *Fear* of their Subjects *Number* and *Force* *, and also their Doubts and Uncertainties, whether *these* will always *Act according* to their Duty and Principles *in this*, as well as *other* Instances, when *tempted* to the *contrary*; (and especially since it is seen as well as said, *That Oppression makes wise Men mad* †, and to attempt those things which otherwise they would not *do* or *allow*,) yet certainly as *this* is a *Caution*, why the Higher Powers should be the less Presumptuous *in*, and the less certain of oppressing their Subjects, without the Danger of Resistance, because there is such a Duty as Passive Obedience; (except they were sure that Men will always *keep* to under-Provocations to *Act against* it;) so whether the Restraint aforementioned be an Argument or not, why Subjects are not wholly defenceless (as to their own Power,) because Passive Obedience is their Duty and Principle; yet are there several Instances of their Power to defend themselves, consistent with this Duty of Subjection aforementioned: When tho' (as I have shew'd) they have not a *Legal* Power to defend themselves by *Force* of Arms, or by *Levying War* against their Higher Powers; yet they have not only a *Legal* and *Gospel*-Power to make *Petitions* ||, *Apologies*, and *Pleas*, for their *Rights* and *Liberties*, as well as *Innocence*; but to *impeach* and *punish* the Evil *Ministers* of such Powers; whilst their *Courts* are *impartial* and open. And by which tho' it is not affirm'd that a Stop will therefore, necessarily be put to all their illegal Proceedings; since *History* and *Experience* have attested the contrary; yet, besides, the Advantage of such *Apologies* and *Pleas* to St. Paul in particular, and the Respite gain'd thereby from the Persecutions of Christians in the Days of *Tertullian*; it is not only a Check to the joining of any Subjects with them in their Arbitrary and violent Proceedings, that the *Lives* and *Reigns*, if not the *Tempers*, of such Higher Powers may be *short* and *uncertain*; and *after which* the said

* Euseb. Eccles. Hist. Lib. 8. Cap. 4. de Diocles. † Eccles. 7. 7.

|| 1 King W. and Q. M. Sess. 2. Cap. 2.

Evil Ministers, may be call'd to a severe Account for what they have done here; but even the Higher Powers themselves, have also a *Memento* not to go in *their evil Ways*; when whether their Subjects be defenceless or not, as to *their own Power*, yet may they be rescued and *preserved* (as I proceed to shew) by *that of other Men*, as well as *God's*: And here not to shew by former and ancient Instances, how it has been the Practice of the Higher Powers in *one State and Government* *, to rise up in defence of the Subjects of *another*, when illegally Oppress'd and Persecuted; or at least, to procure a Deliverance to such Subjects, at the same time they go to War with their Higher Powers upon *other Causes* †; is it not plain that we have a late Instance, of a Deliverance by it to our selves, by the coming and Help of a *Forreign and Independant Prince* to this end? And which however, some have formerly doubted, whether it was justifiable according to the *Laws of Nations*; yet besides the End and Design of it for the securing of his Consort's, her present Majesty's, and his own Title, to the Crown against the Pretender, and for restoring the *Laws and Liberties of England* ‡, has not only procur'd us a *Reprieve* and the beginning at least of a compleat Deliverance, from that *Ruin* ** which we otherwise deserved for our Sins; but is also the matter of our Thanksgivings to God, who was no more to be hinder'd from saving us by one Forreign Prince, than he is from punishing us by another, (the one being *God's Instrument* to save, as the other has been *God's Rod to Scourge*, us) by their respective Actions and Endeavours. And hence it is that however, we do not ascribe the Honour and Glory of the said Deliverance to that which was done by some of the Subjects in this Kingdom, either in the *Act of Settlement*, nor yet in the added *Prayers* yearly us'd upon the 5th of November; yet both in them and in a particular Prayer formerly us'd, we have ascrib'd it to the late King *William* as (under God) the *glorious Instrument* of it.

But to proceed: Supposing that Subjects have neither any Help by *their own Power*, nor by that of *other Men*, yet doth it not follow, that they are made defenceless by the aforementioned Subjection, if we consider the *Hopes* they have of Defence and Salvation from God; whilst they thus continue in that Subjection to the Higher Powers, which he requires at their Hands. It is confess'd (as I have already shew'd) that

* See Socrat. Hist. Lib. 7. Cap. 13. Grot. de jure Belli.

† Lib. 2. Cap. 25. Sect. 8.

‡ See Prayer on Novemb. 5th, after that for Church Militant.

** See his Declaration.

so far and so long, as it is God's Will, they shou'd be try'd or punish'd by the illegal Oppressions of the Higher Powers, they are then defenceless, as to Success, tho' they shou'd have their own and other Mens Help to that End; nay, tho' it is God's Will to deliver and settle them, after they have suffer'd a while *, yet they must stay and wait God's time, to that End, with Patience as well as Hope, and with the Use only of Lawful Means to that End: (For otherwise as they may be said rather to seek to and wait upon Sin, than upon God for Help; so do they encrease their Dangers, if not here, yet hereafter, and, without Repentance, do make their Misery to be Eternal in the next World.)

But now however, neither Subjects nor any other Persons must expect Salvation from their Fears and Sufferings by way of Favour, till either their Faith and Patience are Tryed, or till they are amended by them, and they are made more humble and devout, more Heavenly and Holy, yet when they keep to and Learn their Duty by them, they will not miss of Deliverance, at first or last, either here or hereafter: And tho' I dare not affirm it, for an undoubted and constant Rule, that either the Subjects of the same Generation have their Deliverance, or that Tyrants have their Punishment always here, but rather many of the first die, and the last may still live to do further Mischief; (an Instance of which we have in a Neighbouring Prince, who for many Years has been a Plague to Europe, no less than to his own Protestant Subjects, and how long he may still Live we know not) yet it is not only frequently seen, That as they have done †, so God even requirerth in this World, at least, That he revengerth the Blood, of the Saints in their Sons Days ||: But is it long since assign'd as a Reason by David, why he had no Need as well as Right to kill Saul, because (tho' not to be touch'd by him being the Lord's Anointed, yet) either the Lord would smite him, or his Day shall come to die, or he shall descend into the Battle and perish *: and which last Event was his End, if not his Punishment here. Furthermore, tho' I might instance in the Example of a late Prince, who was nipp'd in the Bud (as I may say) of his illegal Proceedings, and who brought the Judgments of God upon himself, and tho' I might speak of the Reasons we have to hope, that another Higher Power may be humbled, (for his Cruelties, and the Blood he has caus'd to be shed by War and other Ways,) before he dieth; yet waving these, let us consider God's dealing with the Persecuting and Oppressing Em-

* 1 Peter 5. 10. † Juvenal Sat. 10. vers. 113. Judges 1. 7.

|| 1 Kings 21. 29. * 1 Sam. 26. 10.

perors of Rome in the Primitive Times, and we shall find, that they seldom went off the Throne or this World, but with God's Vengeance upon them. Thus not only Nero, Domitian, and Commodus, died violent Deaths; but Valerian and Aurelian, nay, even Dioclesian, Maximin, and Licinius with others, were also Monuments of his Vengeance; either in their violent Deaths, or in the Misery of their Lives. In short, not to instance in any more, however Julian himself was both a Persecutor and a Scoffer *, of Christ in his Subjects, yet he confesseth at last, *That the Galilean was too hard for, and had overcome him, in the Death he suffer'd.*

From which and more Examples it may appear, That however, either for the Tryal or Punishment of Subjects, God suffers them to be ill Treated by Tyrants for a time, yea, to be minsh'd and brought low through Oppression; yet are they not defenceless, because they continue in their Subjection; but rather as the Days and Powers of their Persecutors are numbered with God; and beyond which they cannot exceed, so however, these may seem to be the more presumptuous in their Illegalities, the less they are resisted by their People, yet time will come, when they will meet with a God, who will resist them, (tho' their People do not;) and will also overcome, by converting or confounding them: A God, I say, who is not only a better Defender of his Servants Rights and Liberties against the Higher Powers, than they can pretend to be so for themselves; but it is he by whom they must be deliver'd, or not at all; for Salvation is of the Lord †, and which, if we expect it, must be by doing our Duty, and not by acting against it ‡.

And thus have I at large shew'd, that however it is pretended, yet are not Subjects therefore defenceless, because they continue in Subjection to the Higher Powers, even under their illegal Oppression; and that because as St. Paul declares, *tho' they are persecuted, yet they are not forsaken; cast down, but not destroy'd **; but rather besides their own Power (consistent with their Subjection) to prevent or remove such Evils, they have also the help of others, if not of other Men, yet of God (at his time and in his way) if they are fitted for Salvation, and without which in vain do they expect, tho' they fight and take up Arms to procure it. But,

2dly, Supposing that the evil Consequences of Subjection

† See Constantin ad Synod. Cap. 24. Euseb. Lib. 8. Cap. 13. Lactant. de Morte Persecutorum Sozom. Lib. 6 Cap. 2. Socrat. Lib. 3. Cap. 21. Theodoret Lib. 3. Cap. 25. *ὁ θεὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν*, Psal. 107. 39. 40. 41.

‡ Psal. 3. 8. || 1 Pet. 4. 19. St. Chrysost. Homil. on Mat. 13. 16.

* 2 Cor. 4. 9.

according to the Objection were Certain; yet doth it not either follow from *Duty* or *Prudence*, that Men are to *neglect*, much less that they are to *ridicule* and *condemn* it as a *Sin*: When if it be a *Duty* lay'd upon us by the *Laws* of *God* and *Men* (and that amongst other *Reasons* to prevent the *worse Effects* and *Guilt* of *Rebellion*.) They are not worldly *Inconveniences* which attend, that can exempt us from it, any more than *Christians* may cast off their *Christianity*, because of the *Troubles* and *Persecutions* occasion'd by it; but rather as hereby is the *Trial* of their *Obedience*, and of their *Love* to *God* and their *Duty*, that they will adhere to, tho' they suffer for them in this *World*; so however Men may *Sin* with a good design, viz. to prevent worldly *Evils* both to themselves and others; yet if we believe *St. Paul*, they are not to do *Evil* that good may come, nor yet to *Sin* that *grace* may abound *. And consequently unless the acting against the aforementioned *Subjection* was allow'd and *Lawful*, it is no *Justification* for acting against, because Men may suffer by it.

And as it doth not agree with *Duty*, that, if the *Subjection* aforementioned be such, Men may yet omit or *Act* against, to avoid any ill *Consequences* by it, as to worldly *Dangers*: So neither doth it agree with *Prudence* upon these two following *Reasons*.

First, Because however it is *Objected*, that by the *Practice* of this *Subjection*, Men may not only endanger the loss of their *Civil Rights*, but also of the *true Religion*, yet is the contrary of this *Affertion* true, both as to its *Practice* and chiefest *Rewards*.

2dly, That however the evil *Consequences* of this *Subjection* should be great, as to worldly *Dangers*, yet the evil *Consequences* of acting against it are, at least) equally great, if not more pernicious: And first, because however it is objected that by the *Practice* of this *Subjection*, Men may not only endanger the loss of their civil *Rights*, but also of the *true Religion*, yet is the contrary of this *Objection* true, both as to its *Practice* and chiefest *Rewards*: And tho' I might say the less in *Proof* of this *Reason*, did Men consider what has already been written to this *End*, in a late *Treatise*; yet since, because I have propos'd, it may be expected I shou'd also prove this *Reason*, I proceed to shew, that however the *external Establishment* of the *true Religion* as a *Legal Right*, that however not only the *peaceable Profession*, but the *external Grandeur* and *Exercise* of its *Worship* in *publick Churches* may be hinder'd by the *illegal Proceedings* of the *Higher Pow-*

ers for a time, and which last they may *presume* the more upon, because not Resisted by Force of Arms; yet doth it not therefore follow, that Religion as to it self is *lost*, but rather this may flourish and be practised the *more*, by *Subjection*, as well as *Persecution*.

And for the Proof of this, we need only to consider the State and Religion, as well as Sufferings and Non-Resistance, of the *Apostolical Age*; and by which we may not only find that Men may be Persecuted and yet keep their Religion, both by *doing* and *Suffering* well, without taking up Arms to defend it, against the Higher Powers, but it is no less seen, that however there were such various Persecutions, and such illegal Treatments of the Christians for several Ages, yet did not these destroy but rather adorned and increased them: And what shall I need to add more? When if I may not say that never was the State of the Church more pure, never did Men shew more Love to the Gospel, never did they receive the Lord's Supper oftner, and never were there such Numbers of Converts to Christianity, and with less prospect of secular and Temporal Advantages by it, than in the first Ages of the Gospel State; when Men dared to die, tho' not to Rebel, when Persecuted; yet this I dare be bold to say, that when Christians are illegally Oppress'd by those to whom they are Subject, they have not only then the Tryal of their Courage in Suffering, but they have also a particular Call and way in shewing their Faith, and Patience, their Self-denial and bearing the Cross; and which (if we believe Christ) are Gospel Duties: In short, as it shews the Glory and Purity of the Christian Religion, when its Professors can Practice its Rules, under Temptations to the contrary; so however they may lose (as to the World) by their Persecutions and Subjection, yet do not Christians therefore lose the Rewards any more than they lose the Practice of Religion; when if I may not affirm, that the Rewards of Confessors and Martyrs, are greater than those of other Christians, yet it is not only a greater satisfaction to a Man's own Mind (if he must certainly die) rather to die as a Martyr at Stake, than as a Rebel in the Field; (because more acceptable to God,) but besides the Testimony of St. Peter *, That if a Man for Conscience towards God endure grief, Suffering wrongfully, this is acceptable with God and Thankworthy; it is also the Declaration of Christ. That Blessed are they who are Persecuted for Righteousness sake; for great is their Reward in Heaven †; and again saith, St. Peter,

* 1 Peter 3. 17. 1 Pet. 2. 19.

† Mat. 5. 10. 11. 12.

if ye be reproach'd for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the Spirit of Glory and of God Resteth upon you; on their part he is Evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified: But let none of you suffer as a Murderer, or as a Thief, or as an evil Doer, or as a busy body in other Mens matters (and is it not being busy in other Mens matters, when we even take up the Sword against those whose Office it is to bear it, by the Laws of God and Man?) Yet if any Man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorifie God on this behalf. Especially when as I proceed to shew,

2dly, That however the evil Consequence of the Subjection to the Higher Powers, aforementioned should be great as to worldly Dangers; yet the evil Consequences of acting against it are, equally great, if not more pernicious; at least it is more than Men know, if they are not so in the last Scene and Event of Affairs.

And well may I affirm this as to its Event and Reward in the next World, when however it sometimes happeneth in this Life, that unlawful Undertakings do procure a temporary Deliverance from the fear'd Consequences of Subjection and Non-Resistance (and which they do not always Effect, but rather some Rebellions do End in the Ruin of those who raise them.) Yet still they cannot prevent their punishments in the next World; and which, as without Repentance are no less than Damnation, so are they more pernicious amongst other Reasons, because most Lasting in their Events; and if this be true, what doth it profit a Man, if he gain the whole World and lose his own Soul? Or how is that to be call'd a Deliverance from Danger, which Reprieves Men from Temporal, but exposes them to that which is Eternal.

And what shall I need to add more, as to this ill consequence of Resisting the the Higher Powers? When however, That may not be Resisting (in the Sense of the Apostle,) which some condemn as such; yet is enough to make Men dread the Practice as well as Consequence of it, by raising Arms, Wars, and such like Disturbances against the Higher Powers whilst Supreme: If they would consider these two things. First, That however there are plain directions, Put up thy Sword to St. Peter (tho' drawn in defence of Christ) Let every Soul be Subject to the Higher Powers: Submit your selves to every Ordinance for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King as Supreme, That when they persecute you in one City, flee unto another. That tho' there are also these plain Declarations in the Law, that to Levy War against the Kings or Queens of this Land is

* 1 Pet. 4. from ver. 14. to ver. 17.

† Mat. 26. 52. Rom. 13. 1. 1 Pet. 2. 13. Mat 10. 23.

high Treason, that no Persons singly or Collectively have a Power to make War, either Offensive or Defensive against them; yet on the other hand, there are no Directions or Allowances either in the said Laws of the Gospel, or the Land, which say that Ye either may or ought to take up Arms against them, if they illegally Oppress and Persecute you;

Again, It wou'd be a Check to Resistance, if Men would also consider that however it is plainly said: *They who Resist them, shall receive to themselves Damnation, and that Death is the legal Punishment for taking up Arms against them; yet is it not either said by the Laws of God or the Land that Subjects shall receive Damnation, if they submit to, without taking up Arms against them; against such, as yet, there is no Law *.* But 2dly, Supposing that the ill Consequence of Subjection aforementioned should be great as to Worldly Dangers, yet may the ill Consequences of acting against it too be equally great, if not more pernicious even as to this World; and that both to the Higher Powers, and also to the Subjects; and though the Truth of this may not be doubted in respect of the one, even by those who yet doubt it in respect of the others (I mean the Subjects) yet is it not only seen that the Effects of Non-Resistance, are less dangerous and pernicious to Higher Powers, than are those of Resistance, when by these they are so oft uneasy and unsafe in their Governments; yea, may lose both their Lives and their Crowns; but experience also gives us Instances if not Reasons, That the Evils of Resistance are no less pernicious to the Subjects: Especially where the Resistance is of a long continuance.

And here not to Enumerate or particularize in the several Evils which attended, and follow'd the Rebellion or (as some call them) the late civil Wars, as well as Dangers in which we have been since involv'd, if I may not say, that there was more Blood spilt, and greater destruction of Liberty and Property by them, than was by the unresisted Tyranny of any; or all the Higher Powers, from the Conquest to that time; yet have we a remarkable Instance of the ill Effects of Rebellion in the Children of Israel, when they Rebell'd against the House of David: And whose Example and Practice, tho' urg'd by some, as a Justification, is yet far from being any Example or Rule, That Rebellion is either Lawful or safe, or less pernicious in its Effects, Than is Subjection or Non-Resistance; and that because as it doth not appear from any Law or Revelation, that there is either the like express and divine Prediction for the Translation of Kingdoms in this Age, from the present to other

Higher Powers, or the like *express Prohibition* for the *Reduction* of their Subjects to their due Obedience again, as were given concerning the *Revolts and Rebellion* of Israel, from the House of *Judah* and *David* *; so is it likewise to be observed, That however God was thus pleas'd to foretel and appoint the Punishment of *Solomon's* Sins, by this *their Revolts and Rebellion*; yet were they not only unjustifiable in the *Israelites*, as *Abijam* tells them †, and are even call'd *Rebellion* ‡, but they were also *those* by which *they* chang'd *their former Whips into Scorpions* **, and became more miserable, if not wicked than before. For, not to say, That a *National Idolatry* and the *departing from God*, and the true *Worship* at the *Temple* was caus'd by *this* *their Rebellion* ††, yet is it not only plain, that these Sins follow'd it, and were the design'd *Contrivances* of *Jeroboam* to support it †, but they had little or no peace after their *Rebellion*; when besides the *Wars betwixt Jeroboam and Rehoboam* all *their Days*, and with his Son *Abijam* *, and by which there were slain at one time 500000 Men of *Israel* †, it is also recorded, that however they had *Eighteen Kings* to Reign over them, before they were led into *Captivity*, yet as they scarcely had one good King amongst them all, so *Nine* of them died violent Deaths, not to mention *Jeroboam*, whom the Lord himself stroke ‡.

And can it be suppos'd otherwise but that under the various *Changes* of *those Kings* great were the *Miseries* of *Israel*, by *Divisions* and *Civil-Wars*, by *Rebellions* and *Treasons*?

In short, if I may not say that *Rebellions* and *Changes* of *their Princes* * were their Punishments as well as Sins, yet it is plain, That after they had left the House of the Lord and of *David*, it happen'd unto them, that from being a *Rebellious* they came at last to be *no Kingdom*: And now since from the *Instances* aforementioned, we see that the evil Effects of *Resistance* may be equally if not more pernicious than are *those* of *Passive Obedience*; well may I add that it is more, than Subjects can foresee and say, That they shall not come to pass; especially when we consider, that however the mischiefs which are done by it in *open Wars and Fights* may sometimes be but *short*;

* 1 Kings 11. 12. 31. 33. 35. 37. 1 Kings 12. 15.

† 2 Chron. 13. 5. 6. 7.

‡ 1 Kings 12. 19. So Israel Rebell'd against the House of David unto this Day. ** 2 Chron. 10. 11. 14.

†† 1 Kings 12. 30.

‡ 1 Kings 12. from ver. 26. to ver. 31.

1 Kings 14. 30. 2 Chron. 12. 15. 1 Kings 15. 6.

† 2 Chron. 13. 17. ‡ 2 Chron. 13. 20. * Prov. 28. 2.

because of the Victory of *one* side over the *other*; yet may the other ill Consequents of it be great and *Lasting*, which upon this account may proceed both from the *Higher Powers*, and also the *Subjects*; when, if I may not say, there is great Reason to suppose, that the *Higher Powers* (who are Resisted by their *Subjects*) will be the *more Enrag'd* and *Cruel* against *those* who resist them; and whom they *subdue* by force of Arms; and by which it may come to pass that such Powers may be *more Arbitrary*, and destroy more *Subjects* by *thousands* for their Rebellion, than otherwise they would have destroy'd *hundreds* during their Subjection; yet may the *ill Consequents* of their Resistance be great, even where *Successful* by the *Subjects*, when they may not only hereby add to all its ill Consequents, the *Change of the national Constitution*, but also may become, *Tyrants and Persecutors* themselves, by doing the *same*, if not *worse* things than *those* which were the occasion of their taking up Arms.

And now if where the *fighting part*, or Acts of Resistance may be only *Sort* the ill Effects of it may yet be great and lasting (be the Victory either on the *Subjects* or the *Rulers* side) how much more pernicious may they be so, when the Event of the Resistance is not determin'd for *several Years*? When not only *millions of Lives* as well as *Money*, may be destroy'd and neither sides can say that what they have is *their own*, but even the *Children may rise against their Parents* and put them to *Death**, and the *Parents may do the like to their Children*: In short, whosoever considers the *bitterness* of War in general, or the danger of a long Rebellion in particular, (and of which he may see an Account in the 3d Homily against Rebellion) will find, that Resistance is not the *safest Medicine or Remedy* to heal and remove the *Maladies* of a Kingdom; but rather is *such*, That may it self become the most dangerous Disease to the Community †, if not to particulars. And that these Effects of it are not the *melancholy Representations of a troubled Fancy*‡, (to use Bishop Burnet's Words) a little Reflection on what *some* (yet alive) have seen and known, will easily make out to considering Minds. And thus have I at large shew'd that however, one great Objection against the Subjection which is due to the Higher Powers (especially under illegal Oppressions and Persecutions) be the *presum'd Evil Consequences* of it, yet is not the force of this Objection sufficient to disprove the obligation of it as a *Duty upon us*; and which Consequences of it are no more certain

* Mat. Chap. 10. ver. 21. † See Homily. 1st against Rebellion, p. 346.
‡ See Sermon, on Rom. 13. 5. p. 24. 25.

and pernicious, than are those of Resistance; nor are they a sufficient reason to acquit Men from Subjection, if in it self a Duty: and which (whilst a Duty) is not to be omitted because of Mens Sufferings by it, and which Omission of it is no more allow'd than it is to Sin to avoid Sufferings, or to do Evil that Good may come. And thus having enquir'd into, and also having shew'd the invalidity of that Objection against, which is rais'd from the presum'd evil Consequences of, the aforementioned Subjection, I proceed in the next Obj. 2. place to inquire into, and shew the invalidity of that Objection against it, which is rais'd from the Supposal, if not of a Contract made between the Higher Powers, and People of this Kingdom, when at first made a Kingdom and Monarchy: yet by their Oaths at their Coronation, and in which Contract, if it is not express'd, it is yet suppos'd, that the said Powers and People agree, that if those should not perform their Duty, the People are free or releas'd from theirs; and that in Case of Male-administration and illegal Oppressions it shall be Lawful for the People of this Land to Resist, and take up Arms, against them. This, as it has been urg'd as a mighty Objection against the Doctrines of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance; so I proceed to consider and answer. And first, in answer to it I affirm, that tho' there should have been that which some call an Original Contract formerly, (which tho' suppos'd, is not to be proved;) yet doth it not follow, that there is any such Contract now; but rather the Contents of it may be alter'd and repeal'd by after Laws and Agreements, betwixt the Higher Powers and People of this Nation, in their Representatives. And that the People as well as Higher Powers of this Kingdom, have thus waved this part of such Contract is plain from all such Laws, made by them which declare that (without exception to any Cases) it is High Treason (in any of the Subjects of this Realm) to Levy War against the Kings and Queens of this Realm; that neither the Lords nor Commons, nor the People of this Land have any Power to make Offensive or Defensive Wars against the Kings Majesty, or his Lawful Successors†. And consequently therefore since it is no less the Prerogative of the Higher Powers, than it is the Liberty of the English Subject, and the Priviledges of Parliaments, That they can jointly make, alter and repeal Laws, as there is occasion; and that they can no less Contract and enlarge the Liberty of the Subject, than they can the Rights and Prerogatives of the Crown (and which to deny is no less to reflect upon the Power of Queen and

† 13. Car. 2. Cap. 6.

Parliament *, than it is to make null and void several late Acts for the Liberty of the Subjects;) hence, I say, it follows, that however the matter of the pretended Contract was a Law formerly, yet the contrary to it being a Law now, as that ceases to be a Law to us, so the said Laws, which forbid the raising Wars or taking up Arms against the Kings and Queens of this Realm, are not either the less Fundamental Laws of it, or the more vacated by, because subsequent to, Magna Charta. Than are the Laws for the Protestant Religion, and the Disinherison of Papists from the Throne; and here, if I may not depend upon the Words, and Authority of Parliament by whom it is recogniz'd, that the sole Supreme Government and Disposition of the Militia and of all Forces by Sea and Land, &c. is and ever was the undoubted Right of the Kings and Queens of England) &c. † we yet read that however Magna Charta is one of the most ancient Records we have for the Liberty of the Subject, yet as even this Law was subsequent to the being of Kings in this Realm *, and therefore is not the Original Contract made by the People at their first rise, so is there no mention in it of any original Contract at least, not of any such Covenant in it, that in some Cases it shall be Lawful to take up Arms, or Levy War against the Kings or Queens of this Realm; when tho' it is said in the said Act, that hereby is reserv'd to the Subject all their free Liberties and Customs, which they had in time past and in which there are the Declarations, that all the Customs and Liberties mention'd in the said Charter to be granted by it, so far as appertains to us, and our Heirs, we shall observe; that neither we, nor our Heirs shall procure, or do any thing whereby the Liberties contain'd in this Charter shall be infringed or broken; and if any thing be procur'd by any person contrary to the promises, it shall be had of no Force nor Effect; yet doth it not add, and it shall be Lawful to take up Arms against us, any more than it is taken to exclude future Kings or Parliaments from making Laws for the safety of the same, or the Protestant Religion; Albeit when the Magna Charta was made, it was not the Protestants but the Popish Religion which was then Establish'd: But may some here Reply, that however we have no express Record to prove this original Contract, yet the good of the People and the End of Government suppose it; to which I answer, not at all: When if

* Ejus est abrogare, cujus est condere.

† 12. Car. 2. Cap. 30.

* Being not made a Law till the Reign of Henry the First, or not Confirm'd till the 9th of Henry the III.

I may not say, that the first Original of Government was rather by divine Appointment, and a Consequent of paternal Power, than by any Compacts betwixt the Heads of Families, and their Children and Servants; yet doth it no more follow that either the *antient Patriarchs*, or the *usurping Nimrods*, took the Government upon this Condition of being resisted by the Force of their Children and Subjects, than it follows, that because Government and Governours, were for the good of the Governed.—Therefore if those fail'd of this their End, they might be *Rebell'd against*; when shou'd this be allow'd, it wou'd no less justify Rebellion in any other Government than ours; which (as I have shew'd) was neither allow'd nor practis'd by the *Apostles* and the first Christians, albeit they had as much natural Right to the Benefits of Government (rather than the Disadvantages) as we our selves can pretend to; tho' at the same time they were yet remarkably frustrated by the Emperors under whom they lived. If therefore it is alledged, that when the End of Government is frustrated or defeated by the Higher Powers, any particular Subjects more than others have then a Right to take up Arms, it must either be proved by some agreement, or some particular Laws; which since Subjects (whilst such) have not, by any Laws of Christ or this Realm, they ought not to pretend the Lawfulness of taking up Arms against their Sovereigns, except it appears, that they have a Right and Liberty, so to do from any Contract or Covenant made with them, at their Coronation; which however pretended, yet as I proceed to shew in the next place, is not to be proved.

And here, tho' I shall not stand to shew that the Kings and Queens of this Realm are recogniz'd, and act as such before the taking of the Coronation-Oath: Yet that however when Crown'd they take an Oath to defend the Rights, Liberties, and Religion of their Subjects, they do not make any such a Covenant or Contract whereby Liberty is given to their Subjects, to take up Arms against them, needs no further Proof than the Review of the Oath taken by them; And here not to insist upon the Oaths formerly taken by others,—Let us consider even the Oath to be taken, since the late Revolution, Will you solemnly Promise and Swear to govern the People of this Kingdom of England, &c. according to the Statutes in Parliament agreed on, and the Laws and Customs of the same? The King and Queen

* Thus not only H. the 6th was Proclaim'd, and acted as King, tho' he was not Crown'd till several Years after, but the present Queen Anne, tho' Proclaim'd and Receiv'd as Queen, March 8. 1701, yet was not Crown'd till April 23d, 1702.

shall say: I solemnly promise so to do. Will you to your Power cause Law, and Justice, to be executed in all your Judgments? The King and Queen, I will. Will you to the utmost of your Power maintain the Laws of God, the true Profession of the Gospel, and the protestant reformed Religion establish'd by Law? And will you preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of this Realm, and to the Churches committed to their Charge, all such Rights, and Privileges as by Law do, or shall appertain unto them, or any of them? King and Queen, All this I promise to do &c.

After this the King and Queen laying His or Her Hand upon the Holy Gospel, shall say, The things which I have here before promis'd, I will perform and keep, so help me God: Then the King and Queen shall kiss the Book. The said Oath shall be in like manner Administred to every King or Queen, who shall Succeed. These, as they are said to be the Words of the Coronation-Oath, ever since the Revolution; so doth it appear from them, that however the Higher Powers of this Realm are not only under a natural and Gospel-Obligation to be the Ministers of God, for the good of their Subjects, but they bind themselves by Oaths and Promises to this End; yea, tho' from hence it is, that they not only act against their Duty, but also violate their own Oaths, when they violate their Peoples Rights, and for which they are accountable to God; yet supposing such a Failure in other Princes (of which there is no Fear in her present Majesty, who is no less obliged by her Love and Goodness to, than by her Oath, to nurse rather than oppress, her Subjects) it doth not appear from the said Coronation-Oath, that there is any Power given by it for the Subjects to take up Arms against them; nor is there any Sentence in it, which either expresseth or intimates the Lawfulness thereof; so that unless the Advocates for Resistance can find some other Laws than those of Christ and this Realm, they have

little reason to ridicule and condemn the Doctrines

Obj. 3d. of Passive-Obedience or Non-Resistance, altho' as the third Objection against it they urge its Inconsistency with the Laws of Nature and self-Defence, and by which Last, as they pretend) they are allow'd to resist any illegal Oppressions, tho' even by taking up Arms to that end: Now tho' in Answer to this 3d Objection, I might first put them upon the Proof where these Laws of Nature are (separate from those of Society) or whether they can shew the Revelation of such Laws, antecedent to all Government, or by Tradition from Adam or Noah; nay, 2ly, Tho' I might likewise shew, that however

? See 1st William and Mary, Sess. 1 cap. 6.

the Apostles and Primitive Christians had the same Right by these Laws of Nature, and self-Defence to Resist the Higher Powers, when illegally Oppress'd, as any other Christians can pretend; and yet were they not taught to resist them, but rather were Examples of Passive-Obedience; yet, waving the fore-mention'd Answers to this 3d Objection, that which proves the Invalidity of it is this, viz. That however we have a natural Power to resist Evil where we can exert it, by Lawful Ways and Means; such as are allow'd by the Laws of God and the Government under which we Live; yet doth it not appear either from the said Laws, nor yet by any Law of uncorrupted Nature, that we may defend our selves from Wrong by any Ways, but only by such that are Anf.
just and agreeable to right Reason, and also are allow'd of God; and here if I may not appeal to the Consciences of Men, whether it be agreeable to those natural Notions which even Morality or Nature teaches them to have, concerning the Relative Duties betwixt Parents and Children, Husbands and Wives, Masters and Servants, Kings and their Subjects; that if Adam had dealt unjustly with Eve, she might have Levy'd War against him? That Isaac might have took up Arms and kill'd Abraham, when he went about to slay him; that Ham might Curse Noah, because Noah denounc'd a Curse against him? Or that if Masters strike their Servants wrongfully, these may turn and strike again? Yet waving, I say, the Desire of an Answer to these Queries; I still appeal to those who urge the Laws of Nature and self-Defence (as an Objection against Passive-Obedience to the Higher Powers) whether tho' it be a Law of Nature and self-Defence, to keep our selves from Danger or Starving if we can, we may therefore to this End, either tell a Lye or take away Mens Rights against their Consent express'd or presumed? And now if, notwithstanding the Laws of self-Preservation and Defence, it is not agreeable to other Laws of Nature to tell Lyes or do Injustice, tho' done with a Design to preserve our selves, why yet it shou'd be allow'd by Nature to take up Arms against the Higher Powers, I cannot see; when unless it will be proved that the State of Nature is a State of War, that by Nature there is no such thing as Government nor any Subjection due from Subjects to their Sovereigns, the very Nature of it (unless there be a Contract to the contrary) suppose, that whilst Men are subject to, they have not a Power to take up Arms against, or punish their Sovereigns, and by which they put an end to Subjection; but lastly, was it otherwise, and that by the mere Laws of Nature and self-Defence, the Subjects and the Higher Powers were equal in this Respect;---yet since

it is not only agreeable to the Laws of *Society*, but to those of *self-Preservation* and *Defence*, (at least to the *natural Dictates of Reason*;) that Men should not only hazard the lesser Danger to prevent a greater, but that they should lessen or recede from their *natural Liberties* and *Rights*, where the parting with them is more for their own and other Mens good in General, than is the keeping of them? Hence it is, that (I had almost said by a *natural Consent*) Men do form themselves or are form'd into Societies, for the good of which, and in that of themselves, they yield to the parting with several Enjoyments and Rights, as there is occasion, altho' otherwise or naturally they have a Power to keep them*.

And accordingly it is declar'd by *Grotius*, that however naturally all Men have a Right to repel Injuries from themselves; yet Civil Societies being erected for the good of Particulars, and to prevent the Evils which otherwise might ensue if every Man might be his own Judge and Defender; there is therefore a greater Right given to the Government over Particulars to this End; and by which as, it may prohibit the promiscuous Use of Mens natural Power to resist for the Preservation of Peace and Order; so that it will thus restrain this their Power, is not to be doubted, since otherwise it cannot attain its end; whilst otherwise if every Man may resist as he pleases, it can't be call'd Government, but Confusion and Anarchy, where no Body hears no Body.

However was not this so, viz. that the natural Power of *self-Preservation* and *Defence*, may be restrained by Mens mutual Consent to the Laws of Societies, yet it is not to be denied but they may be restrained by the reveal'd Orders of God; and who, as (being God) he cannot be denied the Power of prohibiting us the Use of those things, and Liberties which otherwise we might take, so that he has thus given such a Restraint, is not only Evident from those Instances in which we are to practise *Self-denial*, and to bear the Cross, but from the particular Direction he has given for Subjection to, and the Prohibition as well as Threatnings he has given to hinder the Resisting the Higher Powers. Nay, tho' by the natural Power of self-Defence, it is not denied but Servants may sometimes prevent their wrongful Sufferings from their froward Masters, it is yet not only enjoyn'd that they shou'd be Subject to the froward as well as Gentle, but even when they do well and suffer wrongfully, they are yet to take it patiently†. And

* 1 Lib. de jure Belli cap. 4. Sect.

† Mat. 16. 24. † 1 Pet. 2. 18. 29.

what shall I add more? as it is a Sign that *those* Christians have not much to urge against Passive Obedience, who have no other Laws to urge against it, but *those* of pretended Nature and self-Defence, and to which a Turk has the same Right and Title; so however in some Cases our own Laws do give the Subjects the Liberty of private self-Defence, viz. in such Circumstances, where because they cannot have the Protection of Laws and the Magistrate, and when they can't bring the Offenders to just Punishment, the Higher Powers are then presum'd to allow them the Liberty of self-Defence, yet do not either the Laws or Higher Powers give any such Liberty of self-Defence, as to take Arms against themselves; but rather they declare the contrary.

Lastly, Although the Success and Benefits of the late Revolution, are objected as destructive to, yet do they not disannul or make void the Duty of Passive Obedience in its true Notion and Extent: When, besides that the said Success and Benefits are ascribed by our own Laws, and Prayers to the late King William, as the glorious Instrument thereof under God, it is also declar'd by the Act of Settlement, that the late King James had abdicated the Government, and therefore, as he ceas'd to be the Supreme Power, his Right, to our Subjection also ceas'd; But then tho' this may be inferr'd from the said Act, yet, lest from hence it should be Suggested, that the Regalities and Prerogatives belonging to the Crown, are made void by the Revolution, it is also added in the said Law, that King William and Queen Mary, having accepted the Crown and Royal Dignity, they became our Sovereign Leige Lord and Lady; to their Royal Persons all the Rights, Regalries and Prerogatives, &c. to the said Crown and Royal Dignity belonging or appertaining, were Rightfully and intirely Invested, Incorporated, United and Annexed: And consequently the same Laws which (until they are repealed) prohibited and made it Treason to Levy War against King Charles the II. made it the like Crime to Levy War against them, and so far as the Statutes in the 12th and 13th Years of his Reign †, establish'd the Duty of Non Resistance to him, they establish'd, the same to King William and Queen Anne (unless those who now affirm the Lawfulness of Resistance do deny either of them to be his Lawful Successors, which yet they do not pretend to deny.)

Furthermore, That however the Obligation to Non-Resistance was suspended or ceas'd by the late Revolution, as to King

† 12. Car. 2. Cap. 20. 13. Car. 2. Cap. 6.

James II. yet it doth not cease in the Reign of *Queen Anne*, tho' it may be proved from all those *Acts* of Parliament still in Force, which make it *Treason* to Levy War against the Lawful Kings or Queens of this Realm whilst such, (and which are more to be regarded than the *Opinions* and *Writings* of some particular Subjects to the contrary) yet is it also to be inferr'd from the *Oaths* and *Prayers* which are still continued and enjoyn'd even since the Revolution: It being not only the continued and Authorized Matter of our Prayers, that God would deliver us from all Sedition, privy Conspiracy, and Rebellion, that he wou'd strengthen the Hands of our Gracious Sovereign *Queen Anne*, and all that are put in Authority under her, with Judgment and Justice, to cut off all such workers of Iniquity as turn Religion into Rebellion: But lest it shou'd be suppos'd, that there is any allowance, since the Revolution, for Subjects to Conspire and make War against the Kings and Queens of this Realm, we find, that besides the obligation which is upon us by Oath as well as Gratitude to bear true Allegiance to her Majesty, it is also enjoyn'd by the Oath of Abjuration*, that we defend her against all Traiterous Conspiracies and Attempts whatsoever, which shall be made either against her Person, or her Crown and Dignity: But why need I stand to prove the Duty of Subjection to the Higher Powers in this Land, still obligatory, (as it signifyeth the not taking up Arms against them whilst such?) since (besides that there are no Laws or Acts of Parliament which allow any Plots or Wars by their Subjects against them, either before or since the Revolution.) There are also such late Instances of Punishment upon some, as Traitors, who attempted the same tho' under the pretence of standing up for an injur'd Prince and Constitution. And thus have I at large shew'd that notwithstanding the various Objections against the Duty of Subjection to the Higher Powers (and particularly as by it is meant Passive Obedience or Non-Resistance in its true Notion) it is not only agreeable to the Laws and Practice of Christ and his Apostles, to the Principles and Practice of the Primitive Church; but likewise it is agreeable to the particular Laws of this Realm, as well as Doctrines of our Church; and consequently ought not to be Ridicul'd and Condemn'd, but to be Defended and Preach'd by its Ministers; the Consideration of which leads me in the last place, to make some Application, and conclude.

And tho' large is the Application which I might make by way of Inference, yet that which I shall chiefly insist upon, is this, viz. that, since it is thus a Christian, Apostolical, Primitive, Legal, and Church of England Duty; (as I have shew'd it to be) its Ministers, at least, wou'd not therefore Ridicule

dicule and Condemn it, much less that they wou'd Ridicule and Condemn their Brethren, who defend and Preach it, in it's due Notion: When tho' a Duty that in some Cases is not only a hard saying to Flesh and Blood, but harder to be Practiced, by them under Temptations to the contrary; yet as, (like to Christianity it self and the taking up the Cross) it doth not therefore cease to be a Duty, so is it not only more consistent with the Safety and Approbation of the Higher Powers *, with the Laws and Safety of the English Subjects, than is the Doctrine and Practice of Rebellion; but is more agreeable to those Directions which are laid upon Ministers how and what they are to Preach: There being Directions from the Orders of Christ and his Church, That we should render to Caesar, the things which are Caesar's, That we should put Men in mind, to be Subject to Principalities and Powers, that we should affirm the Kings or Queens Power in these Realms to be highest under God, to whom all their Subjects by the Laws of God do owe most Loyalty and Obedience, afore and above all other Powers and Potentates upon Earth.

But now will it be proved, that either the Laws of Christ or his Church do give Men a Right and Liberty to Preach up the Lawfulness of Rebellion, or the taking up Arms, against the Higher Powers? Or have we any Precedents so to do from St. Peter or St. Paul, or any of the Apostles? And what shall I add more? Some have not only Condemn'd the Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, as contrary to the Laws of this Land and our Constitution; but have styl'd it Pragmaticalness and a meddling with things out of their Sphere, when Ministers have Preach'd and Defended it; but surely as it ought to be no more charg'd as such, when Ministers Defend, than when they Preach and Print against, it; so, till these can either shew by what Laws of this Realm, Passive Obedience to the Higher Powers is forbidden, and by what Article or Homily it is condemn'd on the one Hand, or by what Laws, Article or Homily, the taking up Arms against them is allow'd and enjoyn'd on the other, They of all Men ought not to Condemn that Doctrine, to which they themselves have Subscribed, and which they can't deny to be the Principles and Practice of the Primitive Church.

But to draw towards the Conclusion of this Application and of the Treatise it self; although there is the less need to preach up the Doctrine of Non-Resistance, from any Temptations we have now to the contrary, in respect of her

* Rom. 2. 4. 5.

present Majesty; unless there be any, who either Refuse, because they deny her Title to this Subjection as Queen, or else think it less dangerous to rebel against her, (as they do against God) because of her Patience and Forbearance; her Mercy and Goodness; and shall such be call'd Friends to the Queen and Constitution of this Realm? Yet since we not only live in an Age wherein there are such various Pamphlets in derogation from this Doctrine of Non-Resistance; but even our Acts of Parliament, which declare the Unlawfulness of taking up Arms against the Kings and Queens of this Realm whilst such, have been reflected upon, as being slavish Doctrine: since this, I say, is so, how can those of all Men (who seem to be so much for Queen Anne) either condemn and disallow the Subjection to be due now, which the Acts of Parliament still in force have given to other Higher Powers; or else pretend the unseasonableness of defending her Right to the same; the Doctrine of Non-Resistance being no less safe Doctrine to her, than it is to other Higher Powers; nor is it less her Right, unless they are Conscious or dissident that she is not the Higher Power; and if so, where is that Loyalty or Zeal for her Right to which they pretend?

And what shall I say more, when tho' I have little reason to expect that those who are prejudiced against this Doctrine of Non-Resistance, or that they who will not either be moved by the Text, or by the Practice of the Primitive Christians (even when they had Power to the contrary,) That they who will not either be moved by those Homilies to which they have subscrib'd, nor yet by the Acts of Parliament, still in Force, to a belief, that the Subjects of this Realm have no legal Power to raise War against the Lawful Kings and Queens of it, (and such they confess our Queen to be,) I say, tho' I cannot expect that these Men should be brought to an acknowledgement of their Error, by my poor Endeavours to this End, unless God is pleas'd to give them Repentance, to the acknowledgement of the Truth; yet I have this to satisfy myself, that I have not only shewn my Endeavours to this End, but I have also taken an occasion thereby to declare my own Principle, which is to be Subject to the Supreme Powers under whom I Live, and not to take up Arms or Rebel against any: Nor do I find to the contrary, but as herein was the Faith and Piety of the apostolical and Primitive Times, so is it no less the Law of our Realm and the Doctrine of our Church, now, that every Soul be Subject to the Higher Powers: That however the obligation to this Subjection may cease as to those, who cease to be such Powers, yet for their Subjects not

to

to be subject to, but to raise War against them that remain our legal Sovereigns, is at least to be guilty of High Treason, if not also to receive to themselves Damnation, unless they repent.

And thus having finish'd my Treatise in Defence of Passive Obedience I have now only this Request to add in the Close of it, viz. That however I propose it to the Examination of others, whether the Contents of this Treatise be agreeable to Law and Truth, yet they would not suppose me an Enemy to our Queen and Government, because I have endeavour'd to prove that the Doctrine of Non-Resistance in its true Notion is no other, than that which is agreeable to the Prerogative and Rights of the one, and the Laws of the other.

F I N I S.

Besides the various ERRATA, as to Punctuation, the Reader is desir'd to Correct, as followeth.

PAge 1 Line 19. read Church; p. 6. l. 34. r. Subjects; p. 7. l. 5. r. those; p. 15. l. 5. r. Refuse; l. 24. r. Arms; l. 28. r. for want of Force but of a Right; p. 16. l. 6 r. So is it no less; p. 17. l. 35. r. Christianity, in fine Marg. add Socrat. l. 1. cap. 4. p. 20. in Marg. dele about Nonconformists; in fine, Marg. add || cap. 6; p. 21. l. 2. r. against; l. 3. r. so; l. 31. after force dele and; p. 23. l. 38. r. have; p. 28. l. 32. dele a; p. 33. l. 13. r. Consequences; p. 34. l. 37. r. House; p. 38. l. 15. r. Charta; p. 39. l. 15. r. than; in several places r. Sovereigns, Sovereignty.

Faint, illegible text at the top of the page, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side.

Faint, illegible text in the middle section of the page.

6 MA 50
Faint, illegible text at the bottom of the page, including a date stamp.